66

66

GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRISM

Edited by

Shingo EINOO

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL CULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

The Śaiva Age

— The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period —

Alexis SANDERSON

The early medieval period, from about the fifth century to the thirteenth, saw a decline in the role of Śrauta sacrifice in the religious ceremonies undertaken by Indian rulers. But it was not that kings turned aside from the brahmanical tradition in a fundamental sense. They continued to uphold the brahmanical social order of the castes and disciplines (*varṇāśramadharmaḥ*) and they were commonly commended in inscriptions from the fifth to the eighth centuries for having rigorously imposed it on their subjects. We see this in the case of the Maukhari Harivarman in the fifth century, the Mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra of Vaṅga and the Parivrājaka Mahārāja Saṃkṣobha of Ḍabhālarājya in the sixth, the Puṣyabhūti Prabhākaravardhana of Kanyakubja, Bhāskaravarman of Prāgjyotiṣa, the Maitraka Kharagraha II Dharmāditya of Valabhī, the Gūrjara Dadda III of Bharukaccha in the seventh, and the Licchavi Śivadeva of Nepal at the turn of the seventh and eighth.[1] The same claim is seen in the account of the history of Kashmir before the advent of the Kārkoṭa dynasty in the seventh century given in the twelfth by the Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa. His chronology for this early phase of his country's history is confused, but it is likely that we should assign to the fifth or sixth century the king Gopāditya whom he commends for having restored the first and perfect Age through his regard for the castes and brahmanical disciplines.[2] He also reports a popular belief of his time that in order to promote the orthodox brahmanical social order the Hephthalite Mihirakula, who ruled Kashmir in the early sixth century, had settled natives of Āryadeśa in his kingdom, which was then, we are told, devoid of the true religion (*dharmaḥ*), being overrun by Dards and Tibetans.[3]

---

[1] *CII* 3, p. 220, ll. 1–2: *varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakraḥ* '[Harivarman], who set in motion the establishing of the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines'; RAJAGURU 1962, ll. 6–9: *varṇāśramavyavasthāhetuḥ *sākṣād* (corr. RAJAGURU : *sākṣad* Ep.) *dharma *ivopāttajanmā* (corr. : *ivopāntajanmā* RAJAGURU) *...paramamāheśvaro mahārājādhirājaśrīgopacandra-* 'Mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra, entirely devoted to Śiva, who caused the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines to be established, as though he were Dharma incarnate'; *EI* 8:28, ll. 11–12: *varṇāśramadharmasthāpanābhiratena* (Saṃkṣobha); *EI* 4:29, l. 3: *varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakraḥ* (Prabhākaravardhana); *EI* 12:13, ll. 34–35: *bhagavatā kamalasambhavenāvakīrṇavarṇāśramadharmapravibhāgāya nirmito bhuvanapatir* 'King [Bhāskaravarman], created by Brahmā himself to separate the caste-classes and disciplines that had abandoned their duties'; *CII* 3, pp. 173ff., ll. 43–44: *sākṣād dharma iva samyagvyavasthāpitavarṇāśramācāraḥ* '[Kharagraha II Dharmāditya], who established the observances of the the caste-classes and disciplines, as though he were Dharma in visible form'; *CII* 4i:21, ll. 7–9: *mahāmunimanupraṇītapravacanādhigamavivekasvadharmānuṣṭhāna*pravīṇo* (em. MIRASHI : *pravaṇi* Ep.) *varṇāśramavyavasthonmūlitasakalakalikālāvalepa<ḥ>* '[Dadda III], who uprooted all the taints of this [degenerate] age of Kali by establishing the separation of the caste-classes and disciplines, well-versed in the execution of his duty [as the king] through discriminating understanding of the teachings authored by the great sage Manu'; *LKA* 140, ll. 1–2: *suvihitavarṇāśramasthitir licchavikulaketur ... mahārājādhirājaśrīśivadevaḥ* 'Mahārājādhirāja Śivadeva, war-banner of the Licchavi dynasty, who correctly established the system of the caste-classes and disciplines'; *LKA* 143, l. 1: *samyagviracitasakalavarṇāśramavyavasthaḥ* '[Śivadeva], who correctly fashioned the system of the distinct castes and disciplines'.

Seeing these claims of the royal imposition of the *varṇāśramadharmaḥ* one thinks of the non-geographical definition of territory fit for brahmanical rites (*yajñiyo deśaḥ*) formulated by Manu's commentator Medhātithi during the ninth or tenth century, namely that it is any land in which a conquering brahmanical king settles the four caste-classes and imposes on the rest of the population the status of untouchables (*caṇḍālaḥ*). This definition served, I propose, to accommodate the fact of the territorial expansion of brahmanical society into new regions that was one of salient features of the early medieval period.[4]

---

[2] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 1.339: *jugopa gopādityo 'tha kṣmāṃ sadvīpāṃ tadātmajaḥ | varṇāśramapratyavekṣādarśitādiyugodayaḥ* 'Next his son Gopāditya protected the earth and its continents, causing men to experience the arising of a [new] First Age through his attention to [the maintenance of] the caste-classes and disciplines'.

[3] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 1.312–313b: *ākrānte dāradair bhauṭṭair mlecchair aśucikarmabhiḥ | vinaṣṭadharme deśe 'smin *puṇyācārapravartane* (conj. : *pravartanam* Ed.) | *āryadeśyān sa saṃsthāpya vyatanod dāruṇaṃ tapaḥ* '*In order to (conj.) promote pious observance in this land that had been overrun by barbarians of impure conduct, Dards and Tibetans, and [so] had lost the [brahmanical] Dharma, he settled [brahmins] of Āryadeśa. Thereafter he performed a terrible penance'. STEIN (1979, p. 46), no doubt faithfully reproducing the reading of the *codex archetypus*, gives *puṇyācārapravartanam* rather than *puṇyācārapravartane* and this leaves him no alternative other than to take not only *dāruṇaṃ tapaḥ* but also this as the object of the verb: "he performed a terrible penance, and re-established pious observances". But the reading is unacceptable. For even if one can believe, as I cannot, that *puṇyācārapravartanaṃ vyatanot* is not too inelegant an expression for an author of Kalhaṇa's calibre, there remains the fact that it requires us to believe also that *vyatanot* governs two objects even though the conjunction necessary for this interpretation is lacking. I have therefore emended to *puṇyācārapravartane*, which, taken as an instance of the use of the locative of purpose (*nimittasaptamī*), yields an entirely appropriate meaning and supposes a scribal error that is readily explained by the ease with which readers of the Kashmirian script can mistake *-e* for *-aṃ*, the common substitute for *-am*. Furthermore, STEIN's rendering of *āryadeśyān saṃsthāpya* as "after killing the inhabitants of Āryadeśa" is, in my view, much less probable than the alternative adopted here, which is to take the verb form *saṃsthāpya* in its contextually more appropriate meaning, namely 'having settled'.

[4] See SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 400–401, citing Medhātithi, *Manusmṛtibhāṣya* p. 80, ll. 24-26 on 2.23: *yadi kathaṃcid brahmāvartādideśam api mlecchā ākrameyuḥ tatraiva <ca> <svadharma?>vyavasthānaṃ kuryuḥ bhaved evāsau mlecchadeśaḥ. tathā yadi kaś cit kṣatriyādijātīyo rājā sādhvācaraṇo mlecchān parājayec cāturvarṇyaṃ vāsayen mlecchāṃś cāryāvarta iva cāṇḍālān vyavasthāpayet so 'pi syād yajñiyaḥ* 'If somehow foreigners were to invade such [pure] regions as that between the Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī rivers (Brahmāvarta) <and> impose <their religion?>, then even they would definitely become foreign lands [unfit for sacrifice]. By the same standard, if some king belonging to the Kṣatriya or other [suitable caste-class] and of orthodox [brahmanical] observance were to conquer foreigners [in their lands], settle communities of the four caste-classes [there], and impose on those foreigners the status of untouchables, just as in the brahmanical heartland of India north of the Vindhyas (Āryāvarta), then those territories too would be fit for the performance of [Vaidika] sacrifices'.

Thus the first centuries of this period are presented in our sources as marked not by the decline of brahmanism but rather by its imposition, reinforcement, and expansion. Moreover, there is abundant epigraphical evidence of kings throughout this time bringing Vaidika brahmins into their kingdoms by making them grants of tax-exempt land,[5] thereby extending the penetration of brahmanical culture while facilitating the administration of their territories and promoting agricultural development.[6]

Nonetheless, while kings continued to accept their role as the guardians of the brahmanical order (*varṇāśramaguruḥ*), their personal religious commitment generally took the form of Buddhism, Jainism, or, more commonly, devotion to Śiva, Viṣṇu, the Sun-God (Sūrya/Āditya), or the Goddess (Bhagavatī), the deities of the new initiatory religions, allegiances that were commonly declared in their inscriptions by the inclusion amid their royal titles of epithets that mean 'entirely devoted' to the founder or deity of whichever of these religions they favoured.

---

[5] On the duty of the king to donate [tax-free] land and other valuables to learned Vaidika brahmins (*viprāḥ*, *śrotriyāḥ*) see, e.g., *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.315–320; 1.323: *nātaḥ parataro dharmo nṛpāṇāṃ yad raṇārjitam | viprebhyo dīyate dravyaṃ ...* 'There is no higher religious obligation for kings than that of bestowing the wealth they acquire through war on learned Vaidika brahmins ...'; *Viṣṇusmṛti* 3.81–82: *brāhmaṇebhyaś ca bhuvaṃ pratipādayet ...* 'He should bestow land on brahmins'. On the king's duty not to tax learned Vaidikas see *Manusmṛti* 7.133ab: *mriyamāṇo 'py ādadīta na rājā śrotriyāt karam* 'Even though dying [through poverty] a king may not levy a tax from a learned Vaidika'. The giving of land to learned brahmins is already advocated at length as the king's religious duty in the *Mahābhārata* (*Anuśāsanaparvan*, *Adhyāya* 61); and that passage includes an injunction that it should be read to the king immediately after his consecration (13.61.36: *abhiṣicyaiva nṛpatiṃ śrāvayed imam āgamam*).

[6] For a study of land-grants to brahmins (*brahmadeyam*, *agrahāraḥ*, *śāsanam*) during our period in a particular region, Orissa and northern Andhra Pradesh, see SINGH 1994, pp. 123–243. For the same in the Far South in Pallava and Cola times see KARASHIMA 1984, especially pp. 3, 36–40, and 129; and STEIN 1994, especially pp. 63–89 and 141–172. The migration of groups of north-Indian Vaidika brahmins as recipients of royal grants is the subject of DATTA 1989. See also DUTTA 1995, pp. 97–118 on the practice and implications of land-grants to brahmins in northern India c. 400–700.

THE DOMINANCE OF ŚAIVISM

Among these alternatives devotion to Śiva was the most commonly adopted. During this period the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ* 'entirely devoted to Śiva' is the most frequently encountered in declarations of the religious adherence of rulers;[7] and of the many temples surviving or reported in inscriptions that were established by rulers and other notables from the late sixth century onwards in the subcontinent, the Khmer realm, the Cham kingdoms of Indo-China, and the kingdoms of Java and Bali, those dedicated to the worship of this god are much the most numerous.[8]

The preponderance of Śaivism during this period is also revealed by evidence that all the other religious traditions competing for patronage were colonized or

---

[7] The royal epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ* first appears in the epigraphical record in the fourth century in Andhra, in an inscription of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Devavarman of Veṅgīpura (*EI* 9:7, ll. 1–7), probably the earliest of the Śālaṅkāyanas in our records since this inscription alone is in Prakrit: *sirīvijayaveṅgīpurā bhagavato cittarathasāmipādānujjhātassa bappabhaṭṭārakapādabhattasya paramamāhessarassa sālaṅkāyanassa asamedhayājino mahārājasirīvijayadevavammassa vayaṇena* ... 'From victorious Veṅgīpura: by the command of the Śālaṅkāyana, who has performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice, the venerable Mahārāja Vijayadevavarman, favoured by [his *kuladevatā*, the Śiva] Citrarathasvāmin, loyal to [his] venerable father, entirely devoted to Śiva ...'. It is mostly found in inscriptions but occasionally appears on coinage. Thus the coins of Kṛṣṇarāja, the Kalacuri king of Māhiṣmatī, who ruled c. 550–575, have on their reverse, (with corrected orthography): *paramamāheśvara mātāpitṛpādānudhyāta śrīkṛṣṇarāja* (MIRASHI, *CII* 4i p. clxxxi). This is the standard term, as is confirmed by its use in literary sources. But we also find the synonym *atyantamāheśvaraḥ* (e.g. *CII* 5:3, l. 8: Vākāṭaka Pṛthivīsena I, late fourth century), and, though very rarely and not to my knowledge in any inscription, *paramaśaivaḥ* (PETECH 1984, pp. 57 and 61: the twelfth-century Nepalese kings Indradeva and Ānandadeva in the colophons of manuscripts). That the Taddhita *māheśvaraḥ* is to be understood as formed from the name Maheśvara in the meaning 'devoted to Maheśvara' (*maheśvarabhaktaḥ*), i.e. 'devoted to Śiva', is proved beyond doubt by the occurrence in inscriptions of analytic renderings of parallel terms. Thus where the affiliation is with Viṣṇu (/Bhagavat) we see not only *paramabhāgavataḥ* but also *paraṃ bhagavadbhaktaḥ* and in the case of the Sun-god (Sūrya/Āditya) we see both *paramasauraḥ* and *paramādityabhaktaḥ*. And there are some cases in which the name of the deity precludes any but the analytic form. Thus where the deity is the Goddess or Mahābhairava we see *paraṃ bhagavatībhaktaḥ* and *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktaḥ*. For all these epithets see MIRASHI *CII* 3, pp. 253–254, n. 3.

[8] This can readily be observed by perusing the published volumes of *EITA*. On the pre-eminence of Śaivism among the Khmers up to the fall of Angkor see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 402–421. For the situation in Karnataka, where Śaiva foundations greatly outnumbered others throughout the perod from the fifth to fourteenth centuries see p. 298.For Kashmir see p. 298, and for Andhra see p. 300.

profoundly influenced by it. In the first part of this study I shall present this evidence for each religion in turn, but with particular attention to Buddhism. In the second I shall attempt to explain the factors that enabled Śaivism to attain this dominant position.

THE INCORPORATION OF ŚĀKTISM

The worship of the Goddess was progressively subsumed within Śaivism, being promoted by its adherents as a higher form of that religion.[9] The Śaiva mainstream was, as one might expect, focused on Śiva. This is so in the earliest forms of the religion, which later Śaivas would call the Atimārga, practised by such Śaiva ascetics as the Pāñcārthikas, Lākulas, and Somasiddhāntins, and it continued to be so in the Siddhānta, the core tradition of the Mantramārga that emerged out of the Atimārga from about the fifth century onwards, first in the corpus of *Niśvāsa* scriptures[10] and then in a number of others, notable among which are the *Pārameśvara* (*Pauṣkarapārameśvara*), the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Kālottara* in a number of redactions, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Parākhya*, the *Mṛgendra*, the *Bṛhatkālottara*, the *Mayasaṃgraha*, the *Devyāmata*, and the *Mohacūḍottara*, the last three representing a sub-corpus of texts of more restricted application concerned with the rituals of the installation of images and the consecration of temples, an area in which officiants of the Siddhānta were the dominant operatives. But as this Saiddhāntika core grew it was progressively surrounded by a diverse array of related liturgical systems for the propitiation of various forms of the ferocious deity Bhairava, seen by his devotees as a higher, more esoteric manifestation of Śiva, and of forms of the Goddess seen as embodiments of Śiva's divine power (*śaktiḥ*). The Śaiva scriptures devoted to the cult of Bhairava came to be known collectively as the Mantrapīṭha or Mantra Corpus, headed by the *Svacchandatantra*, which teaches the cult of Svacchandabhairava and his consort Aghoreśvarī, and the earlier among those devoted to cults of Goddesses as the Vidyāpīṭha or Vidyā Corpus,[11] headed by (1) the *Jayadrathayāmala*, also known as the *Śiraścheda*, consisting of four parts called hexads (*ṣaṭkam*) because each is approximately six thousand verses in length, which teaches the cult of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī or Kālī in the first and those of numerous goddesses worshipped as her esoteric embodiments in the remaining three parts, evidently added at a later date—closely related to parts of this huge corpus are the scriptures of the Kālīkula, *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva*, *Kālīkulapañcaśataka* and others, that were the scriptural basis of the Kālīkula Kālī cult known as the Krama, Mahānaya, or Mahārtha—, (2) the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, which teaches the cult of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, to which the *Mālinīvijayottara* is related, the scripture taken as the foundation of the Trika variant of Śākta Śaivism expounded in the *Tantrāloka* of the great Kashmirian Śaiva Abhinavagupta (*fl.* c. 975–1025), (3) the *Picumata* or *Brahmayāmala*, which teaches the cult of the goddess Caṇḍā Kāpālinī and numerous related Kalpas, and (4) the texts of the *vāmasrotaḥ*, of which only the *Vīṇāśikha* has come down to us intact, which teach the cult of the four goddesses Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajitā, and Aparājitā, the sisters of the god Tumburu, venerated as an aspect of Śiva.[12]

---

[9] On the Śākta elements in Śaivism see SANDERSON 1988, 1995a, and 2007a.

[10] On the transitional character of the *Niśvāsa* between the Lākula Atimārga and the mature Siddhānta see SANDERSON 2006, and 2001, pp. 29–31, fn. 32. On the probable date of its earliest part see GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007.

[11] For the use of the term *pīṭham* in this context in the meaning 'corpus' or 'collection' see *Tantrāloka* 37.18c–19c1, quoting or paraphrasing the lost *Ānandaśāstra*: *śrīmadānandaśāstrādau proktaṃ bhagavatā kila || samūhaḥ pīṭham etac ca dvidhā dakṣiṇavāmataḥ | mantro vidyeti* 'The Lord has taught in such scriptures as the *Ānanda* that *pīṭham* [here means] the corpus [of the non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva scriptures]. It is divided into two, to the right and left [respectively], namely the

---

Mantra[pīṭha] and the Vidyāpīṭha'. The terms 'right' and 'left' assigned to the two Pīṭhas follow the common notion that these are the relative positions of the male/masculine and female/feminine, Mantras being masculine and the deities they embody male and Vidyās being feminine and their deities female.

[12] The distinction in terms of left and right between the two Pīṭhas in the passage of the *Ānanda* cited in the preceding footnote must not be confused with that between the right current (*dakṣiṇasrotaḥ*) and the left current (*vāmasrotaḥ*) of the Śaiva scriptures, which derives from the fact that these are thought to have emerged from the right and left faces of the five-faced composite Sadāśiva, those of Aghora (Bhairava) and the feminine Vāmadeva respectively. For of the texts of the two Pīṭhas only those of the cult of the four sisters are assigned to the latter. The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Picumata* are both assigned to the former, while according to itself the first *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala* is a hybrid of both (*ubhayātmakam*); see SANDERSON 2002, pp. 1–2. Of the other three faces the front and rear, the faces of Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta, are seen as the source of the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras, texts concerned respectively with procedures for the curing of the effects of poisons and demonic possession, while the upper face, that of Īśāna, is seen as the source of the scriptures of the Siddhānta, revealing that this, unlike the distinction between the two Pīṭhas, is a Siddhānta-centric system of classification. It is adapted by the non-Saiddhāntika Abhinavagupta as the basis of his esoteric account of the nature of the Śaiva canon in the *Mālinīvijayavārtika* but only by adding a sixth, upper-upper current (*ūrdhvordhvasrotaḥ*) above the Siddhānta as the source of the non-dualistic Kaula (Śākta) revelation that he takes to be the ultimate ground of the entire canon. *Mālinīvijayavārtika* 1.160–163b: *prakṛtaṃ brūmahe devīvisṛṣṭāś citrasaṃvidaḥ | yāvat tāvat tad ūrdhvordhvaṃ sroto yad bhedavarjitam* || 161 *saurabhargaśikhādīni tataḥ śāstrāṇi tenire | uktaṃ bhargaśikhāyāṃ ca devena parameṣṭhinā* || 162 *ūrdhvasrotodbhavaṃ jñānam idaṃ tat paramaṃ priye | paramadhvaninordhvotthasaṃvidrūpābhidhāyinā* ||

To these we may add the scriptures of two later Śākta cults, those of the goddesses Kubjikā and Tripurasundarī. The scriptures of the former, the *Kubjikāmata* and related texts such as the *Ṣaṭsāhasra*, do not claim to be part of the Vidyāpīṭha. But they are closely related to, and draw heavily on, the subcorpus of texts within the Vidyāpīṭha that is headed by the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and is asssociated with the Śākta system that would be developed under the name of the Trika: the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* itself, the *[Trika]kularatnamālā*, the *Tantrasadbhāva*, the *Devyāyāmala*, and the *Triśirobhairava*. Also allied in character is the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* or *Vāmakeśvarīmata*, the fundamental scripture of the cult of the goddess Tripurasundarī. This, which became the most widely established of India's Śākta cults, has no direct antecedents in the Vidyāpīṭha literature, but is rather an independent development out of an earlier Śākta tradition of the propitiation of goddesses known as the Nityās in which rites for success in love predominated.[13] This early cult was eclipsed by its

---

īśānavaktraniryātāt siddhāntād bhedam ādiśat 'I shall return now to the matter in hand. The nondualistic upper-upper stream is present when the various modes of consciousness are [still] in the state of [primal] emission within the Goddess [Parā]. From this [state of fusion] are created the *Saurabhargaśikhā* and other such [nondualistic (Kaula) scriptures]. And the Supreme Lord has spoken [to this effect] in the *Bhargaśikhā* [itself], saying, "This knowledge, O beloved, is the supreme product of the upper face". By using the word supreme [here] in reference to the nature of the consciousness that has arisen from this upper [face] he shows that he means something different from [and superior to] the Siddhānta, which has come forth from the face of Īśāna'.

[13] The distinctness of this tradition is expressed in the *Kumārīkhaṇḍa* of the *Manthānabhairava* in an account of the hierarchy of the various soteriologies. It places those who follow the scripture(s) of the Nityās above those of the Atimārgic traditions (Mausula, Vaimala, Lākula) and below those of the Bhairava corpus comprising the scriptures of the left and right currents. Above this it places six Śākta Tantras (*parāṣaṭkam*): three of the Trika (*Ṣaḍardha* [=*Mālinīvijayottara*], *Bhairava[kula]*, and *Vīrāvalī*, then the *Kālīkula* [texts] of the Krama, and finally itself, in two scriptural levels. It is significant that it does not put the Nityā cult on the level of its Śākta Tantras or even on that of the Bhairavatantras below them; see f. 213r3–7 (*Muktisaṃgrahasūtra*, vv. 108–114c): **musulāyudhahastānāṃ* (em. : *mausulāyudhahastānāṃ* Cod.) *māyātattvaṃ paraṃ padam | śuddhajñānamayā vidyā vaimalānāṃ paraṃ padam* || 109 *aṣṭapramāṇavedajñā lākulārthaviśāradāḥ | vrate pāśupate caiva aiśvaraṃ paramaṃ padam* || 110 *navanityāgamajñānāṃ śivatattvaṃ paraṃ padam | tasyordhve *kāraṇān* (em. : *kāraṇāḥ* Cod.) *pañca tyaktvā ūrdhvaṃ tu bhairava<ḥ>* || 111 **sāṣṭatantratāntrikānāṃ* (?) *nityānandaṃ paraṃ padam | samanāntakalātītaṃ vāmadakṣiṇasaṃsthitam* || 112 *paṅktikrameṇa mokṣo 'sti satyaṃ nāsty atra saṃśayaḥ | tasya ūrdhve parāṣaṭkaṃ upary upari saṃsthitam* || 113 *ṣaḍardhaṃ prathamaṃ bhedaṃ bhairavākhyaṃ dvitīyakam | vīrāvalī tṛtīyaṃ tu caturthaṃ kālikākulam* || 114 *tatas tv ādyāvatāraṃ tu tasya ūrdhvam anāhatam | śrīmatkulālikākhyaṃ* 'The final destination of the [Mausula Pāśupatas,] those who carry a club in their hands, is Māyātattva. That of the Vaimala[pāśupata]s is Śuddhavidyā[tattva]. For those who are versed in the Lākula[pāśupata] doctrine,

much more successful successor. But nonetheless evidence of it has survived, attesting two forms. One is taught in the *Nityākaula*, of which a single, incomplete manuscript has come down to us in Nepal. Here the goddess Tripurā is surrounded by a circle of twelve deities comprising eleven Nityā goddesses and Kāmadeva, the Indian Cupid.[14] The other has been preserved in the eclectic *Manthānabhairava*, whose *Siddhakhaṇḍa* contains detailed manual-like instructions for a Śākta cult of Tripurā and nine Nityās with Kāmadeva as her consort.[15] The earlier prominence of the Nityā cult is indicated by the fact that a syncretistic text of the cult of Kubjikā, the **Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya*, contains a section drawn from the *Nityākaula*, or from some lost text closely related to it, in which it sets out this cult as the 'teaching of the southern order' (*dakṣiṇagharāmnāyaḥ*), grouping it with the cult of Kubjikā, the cult of Kālī (Kālīkula) in a form attested in the *Jayadrathayāmala* and the related corpus of the scriptures of the Krama or Mahānaya, and a form of Śākta worship agreeing closely with that found in the Trika, calling these the teachings of the western, northern, and eastern orders respectively (Paścimagharāmnāya, Uttaragharāmnāya, and Pūrvagharāmnāya).

The Śāktism of this tetradic schema of the directional Āmnāyas can be distinguished broadly from the earlier Śāktism of the Vidyāpīṭha by a marked tendency to expurgate one of the most conspicuous features of the latter, namely its embeddedness in the intensely transgressive tradition of Kāpālika asceticism whose roots lie in the Somasiddhāntin division of the Atimārga. Since the Śāktism of the Āmnāyas refers to itself as Kaula we may use this term to designate these post-Kāpālika developments. However, like most terms applied to traditions subject to change through time it serves at best to indicate a tendency rather than an absolute distinction. For while the cults of Tripurasundarī and Kubjikā adhered to this mode of self-definition and the Trika that developed out of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* also came to do so,[16] the cult of Kālī that came to constitute the Kaulas' Northern Teaching (*uttarāmnāyaḥ*) remained both Kaula in its self-definition and firmly Kāpālika in its practise.[17]

---

mastering the eight *Pramāṇa* scriptures, and for [those, the Pāñcārthikapāśupatas, who engage] in the Pāśupata observance, it is [the Tattva] of Īśvara. For those versed in the scriptural tradition of the Nine Nityās it is Śivatattva. Above that is Bhairava, transcending [all] the five Causes: Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Īśvara, and Sadāśiva]. This, eternal bliss, is the final destination of the Tāntrikas of the Tantras of the eight [Bhairavas] [v. 132: the *Niṣkala-Svacchandabhairava*, the *Sakala-Svacchandabhairava*, the *Bahurūpabhairava*, the *Aghorīśabhairava*, the *Vyādhibhakṣabhairava*, the *Candragarbhabhairava*, the *Vijñānabhairava*, the *Tumburubhairava* (perhaps =the *Vīnāśikha*), and the *Amṛteśvarabhairava* (=*Netratantra*)]. It is beyond the [universe] that culminates in Samanā and is established in [the two divisions of the Bhairavatantras, those of] the left [current (*vāmasrotaḥ*)] and [those of] the right [*dakṣiṇasrotaḥ*]. The truth—there is no [room for] doubt in this matter—is that liberation is [attained in each these systems but] in the manner of ascending a ladder. Above that are the six ascending [divisions of the scriptures] of Parā. The first division is the *Ṣaḍardha* (=*Mālinīvijaya*, vv. 125a and 133cd), the second the *Bhairava[kula]* (=*Klinnānvayayoga*, v. 134a), the third the *Vīrāvalī* (=*Vīrāvalīkulāmnāya*, v. 134c), and the fourth the *Kālīkula* [scriptures] (=*Kālikākrama*, v. 134d). Above this is the *Ādyāvatāra* [of the Paścimāmnāya], and above that the Anāhata [revelation] called *Kulālikā[mnāya]*'. It is striking that this passage omits the Saiddhāntikas. It is therefore likely that the text has lost a line or verse here. This suspicion is strengthened by the verses that follow. For in these the order of systems is repeated with *śaivam*, i.e. the Siddhānta's scriptures, between the *pāśupatam* and the eight Bhairavatantras (v. 128bcd: *tathā pāśupataṃ mahat | śaivaṃ tasya viśeṣaṃ tu bhairavāṣṭakanirṇayam*). Since the passage also omits Sadāśivatattva it is probable that it was this level that was assigned to the Saiddhāntika system in the lost line or verse. To assign the Saiddhāntikas to Sadāśivatattva would, of course, be to disdain their claim that their *paraṃ padam* is in fact Śivatattva.

[14] The eleven Nityās of this text are Hṛllekhā, Kledinī, Nandā, Kṣobhanī, Madanāturā, Nirañjanā, Rāgavatī, Madanāvatī, Khekalā, Drāvaṇī and Vegavatī; see *Nityākaula*, f. 2r7–2v1.

[15] *Manthānabhairava*, *Siddhakhaṇḍa*, ff. 186v–231r1. The nine Nityās are Kulavidyā, Vajreśvarī, Tvaritā, Kurukullā, Lalitā, Bheruṇḍā, Nīlapatākā, Maṅgalā and Vyomavyāpinī. The section on Tripurā continues to f. 252v and includes the text of the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*. The folio numbers are those of a palm-leaf manuscript in private hands, to which I have had access through digital images kindly provided by my former pupil and present colleague Dr. Somdev Vasudeva.

[16] On the anti-Kāpālika stance of the mature Trika see SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 118–119, fn. 74.

[17] For the Kāpālika/Mahāvratin asceticism of practitioners of the Uttarāmnāya, that is to say of the Kālīkula and Krama/Mahānaya, see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 293–294 (Cakrabhānu, Īśānī, and Jaiyaka), 323 (Cakrapāṇinātha, author of the *Bhāvopahārastotra*). Concerning the date of Cakrapāṇinātha I was able to say in 2007a (p. 417) only that he was earlier than his commentator Ramyadeva, who was later than Kṣemarāja, which is to say, next to nothing. However, since then I have read a Nepalese manuscript, NGMPP C114/22, which contains his *Bhāvopahārastotra* under the title *Bhāvopahārapūjā*, and this enables us to include him among relatively early authors, since the manuscript is dated in 1158/9. To the Kashmirian exponents of the Krama identified as followers of the Kāpālika observance in 2007a I now propose to add one more. According to a manuscript of the *Chummāsaṃketaprakāśa* that I had not seen at that time, which contains the final verses of the work that are lacking in the one manuscript that I had seen then, the redactor of this text attributed to Niṣkriyānanda was one Anantaśakti. He is described there as *mudrādharaḥ* (A, f. 11r7–9): *saṃsārasaṃbhramacayapravibhāgabandhasaṃbandhasaṃkṣaya*gatir* (em. : *gater* Cod.) *avikalpamūrtiḥ | sākṣād anābiladhiyā laghuvākkrameṇa mudrādharas tu vidadhe tad anantaśaktiḥ*. This expression I take to have the same meaning as *pañcamudrādharaḥ* 'wearer of the five sect marks [of the Kāpālika/Mahāvratin]'; see, e.g., *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, Paṭala 14 (*ṣaṭsamayabhedaḥ*), one of the chapters that is not part of the original work of this name, vv. 19–20: *caturdaśapramāṇena yuktaṃ kāpālam ucyate | kāpāle ca vrataṃ mukhyaṃ sarvapāpanikṛntanam | tasmin vrataṃ cared yas tu ṣaṇmāsān muktim āpnuyāt | pañcamudrādharaḥ śāntaḥ samayācārapālakaḥ*; and *Kubjikāmata*

In general we may say that these non-Saiddhāntika texts with their strongly Śākta orientation emerged after the Siddhānta or at least after the emergence of its earliest scriptures. Thus, for example, it is clear in my view that the *Svacchandatantra* was redacted after the formation of the Saiddhāntika *Niśvāsa* corpus, the *Tantrasadbhāva* after the *Svacchanda*, the *Kubjikāmata* after the *Tantrasadbhāva*,[18] the first hexad of the *Jayadrathayāmala* after the *Kubjikāmata*,[19] and the remaining three hexads after the first.[20] However, I see no reason to conclude that all that is found in the non-Saiddhāntika corpus is post-Saiddhāntika and some grounds for thinking that some elements may be as old or older. This may be the case with the cult of the four sisters of Tumburu. For that is known to the Buddhist Dharmakīrti (*fl.* c. 550–650),[21] and the first two folios of a post-scriptural text on this cult, the **Devītantrasadbhāvasāra*, written in learned style in the Āryā metre, have survived among the Buddhist manuscripts uncovered in Gilgit in 1931. They may be assigned on palaeographical grounds to around the middle of the sixth century.[22] A second area of the non-Saiddhāntika canon that is likely to be very early in origin is that of the Yāmalatantras assigned to the Vidyāpīṭha, represented in our surviving manuscripts by the 12000-verse *Picumata*, also called the *Brahmayāmala*. For the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, whose earliest surviving manuscript was completed in 810, lists seven Yāmala texts, beginning with the *Brahmayāmala*, as Tantras of the Mother Goddesses (*mātṛtantrāṇi*).[23] The date of the text itself is still a matter of debate; but it is unlikely to have been composed later than the end of the seventh century or earlier than the sixth.[24] It is certainly

---

25.31cd: *pañcamudrādharo vāpi bhasmaniṣṭho digambaraḥ*. He is probably one with the Anantaśakti who wrote the published commentary on the Krama's *Vātūlanāthasūtra* but probably not with the Anantaśakti who has left us a commentary (*Viṣamapadasaṃketa*), as yet unpublished, on the *Bahurūpagarbhastotra*; see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 344.

[18] See the evidence for this sequence in SANDERSON 2001, pp. 20–35.

[19] See SANDERSON 2002, p. 1 and note 4 on p. 21.

[20] See SANDERSON 2002, p. 2 and note 13 on p. 22.

[21] See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 11–13, fn. 10.

[22] No title appears in the surviving fragment of this text. The title assigned here is a guess based on the unknown author's description of his work in verses 3 and 4. There he says that he is extracting the fundamentals (*sāraḥ*) of the Essence of the Tantras (*tantrasadbhāvaḥ*) of the [four] Goddesses (*devīnām*) that had been received from Śiva by a sage identified only as the ornament of the lineage of Atri: 3 *ātreyavaṅśatilakenoktaṃ śarvād avāpya yat pūrvaṃ* | *suramuninarāsurāṇāṃ devīnāṃ tantrasadbhāvaṃ* ‖ 4 *tasmād aham apy adhunā vakṣye saṃhṛtya sāram āryābhiḥ* | *spaṣṭatarākṣarapaṅktibhir aviśāladhiyāṃ* **prabodhāya* (em. : *pravodhāta* Cod.) 'The *Essence of the Tantras of the Goddesses* was received of old from Śiva by the ornament of the lineage of Atri and taught to the gods, sages, men, and titans. I in turn have summarized its fundamentals and shall now declare them in Āryā verses whose lines of syllables will be completely clear in meaning, for the instruction of those of modest intellect'. The script is the stage of proto-Śāradā that Prof. Lore SANDER has called Gilgit/Bamiyan type 2 and also Sonderschrift 1. I stumbled upon the first folio (3221–3222) while searching the facsimiles of the Gilgit manuscripts for proto-Tantric Buddhist materials and communicated this unexpected discovery to Somdev VASUDEVA, then my student, who promptly located the second folio (3340–3341) and presented convincing palaeographical arguments for the date of the manuscript proposed here (email of 7.12.2000), pointing to the presence of the archaic tripartite *ya* ligature, the occurrence of the old style of *hṛ*, and the Gupta style *ru*. The text teaches the Mantras of the four Devīs, who, it says, were made manifest at the beginning of creation so that men could attain supernatural accomplishments and liberation (v. 11cd: *prādurbhūtā devyaḥ siddhyarthaṃ muktaye caiva*), their ancillaries (*aṅgamantrāḥ*), their retinue of [four] Dūtīs and [four] Kiṅkaras (v. 16bc: *dūtyas sakiṅkarā<ḥ>*), Tumburu (v. 17ab: *praṇavaṃ tuṃburusahitaṃ sārthavāhā +*), and the Aṅkuśa (v. 18bc: *sapraṇavaṃ* HŪṂ-PHAṬ-*viniyuktam aṅkuśam etat*). The *Vīṇāśikha*, our only complete surviving Tantra of the *vāmasrotaḥ*, teaches the four Devīs (vv. 30c–32b), Tumburu (vv. 29c–30b), and the Aṅkuśa (v. 41d etc.), but not the Dūtīs or Kiṅkaras. For the fuller pantheon see, e.g., *Devyāmata*. f. 40r1: *jayā ca vijayā caiva jayantī cāparājitā* | *dūtibhiḥ kiṅkaraiḥ sārdhaṃ saṃvṛtas* **tumburuḥ* (corr : *tumburuṃ* Cod.) *sthitaḥ*; *Netratantra* 11.1–27; and *Śāradātilaka* 19.87–105b and *Tantrasārasaṃgraha* 23.37–52 (with the four Dūtīs but without the Kiṅkaras). The expression *sārthavāhaḥ* 'the [international] trader' in v. 17b (v. 17ab: *praṇavaṃ tuṃburusahitaṃ sārthavāhā +*) no doubt refers to Tumburu, who is so described in the Buddhist version of this cult taught in the *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* (47.29b, 52a, 54c, p. 413, l. 12, etc.). According to that source the four sisters and Tumburu are to be depicted sailing in a ship with Tumburu at the helm (47.24: *nauyānasamārūḍhā<ḥ> sabhrātṛsahapañcamā<ḥ>* | *karṇadhāro* **'rthacit* (tentative conj. : *'thacit* Ed.) *tāsāṃ* **tumburunāmasaṃjñitaḥ* (em. : *tumburur nāma saṃjñitaḥ* Ed.). See also here p. 130. This depiction is also prescribed in the Śaiva *Piṅgalāmata*, f. 28v5–6 (*Citrādhikāra*, v. 35): *jayādyāś cakragās tadvat paṅktisthā vā likhet* | *kramāt nāvārūḍhāś ca vā likhyās tumburuḥ karṇadhārakaḥ* 'He should depict Jayā[, Vijayā, Jayantī,] and [Aparājitā] forming a circle or in a line. Alternatively he may depict them on board a ship with Tumburu as the helmsman'. For the early date of this cult see also here p. 129.

[23] See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4 and here p. 229 (171.127–130b) and a discussion of the titles it contains. The oldest manuscript is dated in the year 234. For this date and its equivalence to A.D. 810 see ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER and ISAACSON 1994, p. 326. That the era of the date is that of the Licchavi Mānadeva (=Aṃśuvarman) was first proposed by WITZEL (1986, p. 256, n. 9). The date of the commencement of this unnamed era which is seen in Nepalese inscriptions that begin during the reign of the Nepalese king Mānadeva was determined to fall in A.D. 576 on the basis of Tibetan evidence by Luciano PETECH (1961). Previously it had been assumed that the era was that of Harṣa (A.D. 606).

[24] Yuko YOKOCHI has observed (1999a, pp. 81–82) that the icon of the goddess Mahiṣāsuramardinī seen in texts of the sixth and seventh centuries gives way to a new iconic type around the beginning of the eighth century and that this text belongs with the earlier sources in this regard. The same scholar has shown (1999b, pp. 68–75) that the description of Mahiṣāsuramardinī in 68.10–23 of the text corresponds most closely to the image of Mahiṣāsuramardinī from Siddhi-kī-Guphā at Deogarh, an example of her Gupta subtype B2. She argues that this was carved in the middle of the sixth century or, at the latest, at its the end (pp. 74–75). So, she concludes, "the possibility that the text belongs to the same century can no longer

striking in this regard that it betrays no knowledge of the Siddhānta, its Śaivism being Atimārgic,[25] a circumstance which supports the hypothesis that the polarity seen in the Mantramārga between Śaivism and Śākta Śaivism was already present in some form when the former was still in the Atimārga stage.[26] Royal devotion to Bhairava certainly goes back before the Siddhānta's emergence, being attributed in Vākāṭaka inscriptions to Rudrasena I, who ruled c. 335–c. 360,[27] and a copperplate decree issued by Mahārāja Bhuluṇḍa in 376 from Bagh (Valkhā) in Madhya Pradesh records a grant made to support the worship of the Mothers in a temple of those deities established by an officiant of the Atimārga, the Pāśupatācārya Bhagavat Lokodadhi.[28]

In the light of this evidence that Śāktism was extensively incorporated into and developed within Śaivism it should not be surprising to discover that in spite of the prevalence of the worship of the Goddess in early medieval India kings identified in inscriptions as devotees of the Goddess (*bhagavatībhaktaḥ*) rather than Śiva are very rare. At present I am aware only of Nāgabhaṭa, Bhoja, and his successor Mahīpāla I in the ninth century among the Gūrjara-Pratīhāras of Kanyakubja.[29]

Royal devotion to a goddess, typically as a dynasty's lineage deity (*kuladevī, vaṃśadevī, gotradevī*), was very common during our period, and such deities are often declared in inscriptions to be the source of a king's sovereignty and martial might.[30] But this was not sufficient to mark out kings who worshipped such goddesses as Śāktas. For such worship was common regardless of a king's religious affiliation, and it was in any case inconstant, coming to the fore only on certain occasions, particularly during the autumnal Navarātra festival that inaugurates the season of military activity, when they and associated goddesses received large-scale animal sacrifices;[31] and when this cult was particularly emphasized through the forging of connections with a higher domain of non-periodic, exclusive devotion, then this domain was that of the esoteric goddesses of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha.[32]

THE ETIOLATION AND SUBSUMPTION OF THE CULT OF THE SUN-GOD

As for the cult of the Sun, kings who have been declared in inscriptions to be devotees of this god (*paramasauraḥ*, *paramādityabhaktaḥ*, and the like) are also few and they are mostly confined to the sixth and seventh centuries. We have Dharmarāja of Padmakholī in the Ganjam District of Orissa, Dharapaṭṭa, the Maitraka of Valabhī, Rājyavardhana, Ādityavardhana, and Prabhākaravardhana, the three successive predecessors of King Harṣa of Kanyakubja, in the sixth century, and from c. 570 to c. 665 the Gūrjara feuda-

---

be repudiated" (p. 75). The Gupta type, in one subtype or another, was popular from the 5th century to the 8th.

[25] The *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* is not a text of the Atimārga in the sense that it was written for initiates in one of its systems. For since it is a Purāṇa its target audience is the uninitiated laity. However, the Śaivism that it draws on is Pāśupata rather than Mantramārgic. This Atimārgic background is conspicuous throughout the text; but see particularly Adhyāyas 174–183.

[26] Hypothesis first proposed in SANDERSON 1988, p. 667.

[27] See, e.g., the Tiroḍī plates of Pravarasena II, r. c. 400–c. 450, *CII* 5:11, ll. 3–6: *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktasya ... mahārājaśrīrudrasenasya*. The same formula appears in all the other surviving copper-plates of this king that are complete at this point (*CII* 5:1, 4, 6–7, 10, 13–14, 18). For these approximate regnal dates of Rudrasena I I am following BAKKER 1997, p. 169.

[28] RAMESH and TEWARI 1990:10, ll. 2–6: *bhagavallokodadhipāśupatācāryapratiṣṭhāpitakapiñchikānakagrāmamātṛsthānadevakulasya piñchikānakam eva grāmaṃ saha bhadradattavāṭakagrāmavāṭakacchena devāgrāhāramātṝṇā[ṃ] balicarusattradhūpagandhapuṣpamālyopayojyabhogāya ....*

[29] *EI* 14:13, ll. 6, 7, 7–8: *param bhagavatībhakto mahārājaśrīnāgabhaṭadevas ... param bhagavatībhakto mahārājaśrībhojadevas ... param bhagavatībhakto mahārājaśrīmahendrapāladevas ...*

[30] For some examples see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 288–290.

[31] On Navarātra see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 371 (fn. 64); 2005b, pp. 255–257; 2007b, pp. 263–277 and 294 (fn. 196). For an example of the scale of such annual sacrifices see p. 247 below.

[32] In general we may say that the Śaivism of the Mantramārga holds itself aloof from the domain of calendrical religion, seeing the recurrent festivals of that domain as commemorations of mythic events and therefore as operating on a level of mundane belief that initiates must transcend. That is the territory of Purāṇic religion, which guarantees various rewards but not the liberation or supernatural effects and powers promised to observant initiates into the Mantramārga. Śaiva initiates were merely required to track the Purāṇic calendar by intensifying their own regular cult on days when uninitiated devotees were celebrating Śiva's or the Goddess' activities in the domain of myth-based devotion; see, e.g., *Tantrālokaviveka* on 28.6c–7b. Nonetheless, we see a distinct tendency for the Mantramārga to seep downwards into this domain providing Śaiva or Śākta Śaiva versions of the Purāṇic rituals that mark such major annual festivals as Śivarātri and Navarātra. A Śākta Śaiva procedure for the celebration of Śivarātri was current in Kashmir, as can be seen from the prescriptions set out in the *Nityādisaṃgraha* of Rājānaka Takṣakavarta (ff. 71v–72v15) from the lost *Dūtiḍāmara* and in the 31st chapter of the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* of Rājānaka Jayadratha in the thirteenth century, drawing on this and the *Anantabhāskara*. The same can be seen in various regions in the case of the Navarātra, also known as the Durgotsava. Among the Newars of the Kathmandu valley, the goddess is worshipped in this festival in a Tantric form as Ugracaṇḍā in Paddhatis that incorporate her among such Mantramārgic Śākta deities as Siddhilakṣmī and Kubjikā; see the Newari *Navarātrapūjāvidhi* manuscripts A and B in the bibliography. For her Tantric worship in this context in the tradition of the Paippalādin Atharvavedins of Orissa see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 263–276. In Bengal, where Navarātra was and is much emphasized, we see a Smārta procedure but one that has been strongly Tantricized in the *Durgāpūjāprayogatattva* section of the *Durgāpūjātattva* of Raghunandana in the 16th century.

tories of Bharukaccha (Broach). This is explicitly stated in the case of Dadda I (r. c. 570–595), and Dadda II (r. c. 620–645); and it is probable in the case of Jayabhaṭa II (r. c. 645–665), since it is very likely that the temple of the Sun-god Jayāditya at Koṭipura near Kāvī in the Broach District was founded by him with his name (Jaya-). It is also probable in the case of Jayabhaṭa I (r. c. 595–620), since this was the religion not only of his predecessor and successor but also of his brother Raṇagraha. After Jayabhaṭa II the next three kings of this dynasty, Dadda III (c. 665–690), Jayabhaṭa III (c. 690–715), and Ahirola (c. 715–720), turned to Śaivism, declaring themselves *paramamāheśvaraḥ*. In the ninth century we have royal devotees of the Sun in Rāmabhadra, the immediate predecessor of the Gūrjara-Pratīhāra Bhojadeva I of Kanyakubja, and Vināyakapāla, the latter's grandson, and, in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, in the Sena kings of Bengal Lakṣmaṇasena and Viśvarūpasena, though the former also appears in his inscriptions as a Vaiṣṇava (*paramavaiṣṇavaḥ*) and, more specifically, as a devotee of Narasiṃha (*paramanārasiṃhaḥ*).[33]

It appears that the Sauras, the initiated devotees of the Sun-god, possessed their own canon of scriptures, known, like those of the Śaivas and the Vaiṣṇava followers of the Pañcarātra, as Saṃhitās. A list of eighty-five such texts is given in an account of brahmanical, Pāñcarātrika (Vaiṣṇava), Saura, and Śaiva scriptural authorities, contained in the Śaiva scripture *Śrīkaṇṭhīyasaṃhitā*. No manuscript of this text, which was known to Kṣemarāja (*fl.* c. 1000–1050) and probably to Abhinavagupta (*fl.* c. 975–1025), has come down to us; but I have located its long section dealing with the canons of scripture in the *Nityādisaṃgraha* of Rājānaka Takṣakavarta, a Kashmirian digest of scriptural passages bearing on the duties of initiated Śaivas, compiled at some time after the eleventh century.[34]

---

[33] *EI* 28:16: *sahasraraśmipādabhakto* (Dharmarāja); *EI* 31:39B, l. 8: *paramādityabhaktaḥ* (Dharapaṭṭa); *EI* 4:29, ll. 1–3: *paramādityabhaktaḥ* (the predecessors of Harṣa); *CII* 4i:16, l. 4: *dinakaracaraṇakamalapraṇāmāpanītāśeṣaduritanivaha-* (Dadda I); *ibid.*, l. 52: *dinakaracaraṇārcanaratasya* (Dadda II); *CII* 4i:18, l. 9: *dinakarakiraṇābhyarcanaratasya* (Raṇagraha); *CII* 4i:21, l. 13: *paramamāheśvaraḥ* (Dadda III); *ibid.*, ll. 16–17: *paramamāheśvaraḥ* (Jayabhaṭa III); *CII* 4i:24, ll. 20–11: *paramamāheśvaraḥ* (Ahirola); *EI* 5:24, l. 5: *paramādityabhakto* (Rāmabhadra); *EI* 14:13, l. 6: *paramādityabhakto* (Vināyakapāla); SIRCAR 1983a:27, ll. 35–38: *paramasauraḥ* (Lakṣmaṇasena); *paramasaura* (Viśvarūpasena); *EI* 12:3, ll. 23–25: *paramavaiṣṇava-* (Lakṣmaṇasena); and SIRCAR 1983a:26, ll. 32–33: *-paramanārasiṃha-* (Lakṣmaṇasena). For the attribution of the temple of Jayāditya at Koṭipura to Jayabhaṭa II see MIRASHI, *CII* 4i, p. liv.

[34] The list of the Saura Saṃhitās in the *Nityādisaṃgraha* is to be found on ff. 4v11–5r6 of the *codex unicus*. A lightly edited transcript of the whole excerpt on the scriptural canons has been published as it appears in an apograph contained among the Stein manuscripts of Oxford's Bodleian Library by Jürgen HANNEDER (1998, pp. 237–268). The verses on the Saura canon are 74–88 in his edition. On the date of the compilation of the *Nityādisaṃgraha* see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 422.

Unfortunately, no manuscript of any one of these Saura scriptures has surfaced; and the decline of Saurism as a distinct tradition, of which this is the consequence and evidence, is probably to be attributed, at least in part, to a failure to continue to attract patronage and so maintain its separate identity as Śaivism became more influential and encroached upon its territory.

Thus a *Saurasaṃhitā* of our period sets out the procedure for the worship of the Sun and no doubt drew on the Saura tradition.[35] But it assigns itself to the canon of the Śaiva scripture *Vāthula/Kālottara*,[36] a text on which it silently draws, gives a Śaiva account of the place of the Sun in the birth of the universe, deriving it through emergence from Śiva expressed in a phrase found elsewhere in the Śaiva scriptures,[37] and insists that Śiva and the Sun are in essence a single deity.[38] Moreover, the worship of the Sun taught in this text was included by the Saiddhāntika Śaivas as a compulsory preliminary (*aṅgam*) of the regular worship of Śiva himself, appearing first in the sources known to me in the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva of Dhārā (r. c. 1018–1060)[39] and then soon afterwards, in dependence on that text, in the

---

[35] A critical edition of this text is being prepared for publication by Dr. Divakar Acharya. I am very grateful to him for sending me drafts of this edition. The text survives in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript with a scribal date that falls in A.D. 949 (NAK MS 1/1231, NGMPP A1161/6).

[36] *Saurasaṃhitā* 1.5: *noktā pūrvaṃ tu yā vatsa gopitā saurasaṃhitā | tantre tu vāthule sā tu rahasyaṃ na prakāśitā*. Final colophon: *iti vāthule kriyāpāde saurasaṃhitāyām* . . . .

[37] *Saurasaṃhitā* 1.10–12: *adṛṣṭavigrahāc chāntāc chivāt paramakāraṇāt | kriyāśaktir viniṣkrāntā paratejasamanvitā* ‖ 11 *ākāśe tu yadā hy ulkā sṛṣṭihetor adhomukhī | tasya tejasamāyogād utpannaṃ tejarūpiṇam* ‖ 12 *ādityamaṇisaṃyogād vahniḥ saṃjāyate yathā | śaktitejasamāyogād bhānuḥ saṃbhavitā tathā*. 10ab = *Pauṣkarapārameśvara* (as quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha at *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti*, *Vidyāpāda*, p. 19, ll. 5-6) and *Śrīkaṇṭhīyasaṃhitā* (ed. in HANNEDER 1998, p. 240, v. 1).

[38] *Saurasaṃhitā* 1.15: *ādityaṃ tu śivaṃ vindyāc chivam ādityam eva ca | nānātvaṃ yas tu gaccheta yatnenāpi na sidhyati*.

[39] *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, MS A, f. 3v5–4v2, MS B, f. 4v6–6r2: OṂ HRĀṂ HRĪṂ SAḤ *iti sūryamantreṇa kṛtadehaśuddhiḥ kṛtasakalīkaraṇam arghapātraṃ kṛtvā puṣpādikaṃ saṃprokṣya raktacandanādinā sūryāya mūlamantreṇārghaṃ dattvā sūryaṃ pūjayet | tatra gaṇapatigurupūjānantaraṃ* OṂ AṂ PRABHŪTĀYA NAMAḤ *iti pīṭhamadhye*, OṂ AṂ VIMALĀYA NAMAḤ *ity āgneyyāṃ*, OṂ AṂ SĀRĀYA NAMAḤ *iti nairṛtyāṃ*, OṂ AṂ ĀRĀDHYĀYA NAMAḤ *iti vāyavyāṃ*, OṂ AṂ PARAMASUKHĀYA NAMAḤ *ity aiśānyāṃ*, OṂ AṂ PADMĀYA NAMAḤ *iti punar madhye*, OṂ RĀṂ DĪPTĀYAI NAMAḤ *pūrvadale*, OṂ RĪṂ SŪKṢMĀYAI NAMAḤ *agnau*, OṂ RUṂ JAYĀYAI NAMAḤ *dakṣiṇe*, OṂ RŪṂ BHADRĀYAI NAMAḤ *nairṛte*, OṂ REṂ VIBHŪTYAI NAMAḤ *vāruṇe*, OṂ RAIṂ VIMALĀYAI NAMAḤ *vāyavye*, OṂ ROṂ AMOGHĀYAI NAMAḤ *saumye*, OṂ RAUṂ VIDYUTĀYAI NAMAḤ *īśāne*, OṂ RĀṂ SARVATOMUKHĀYAI NAMAḤ *karṇikāyāṃ saṃpūjya visphurāṃ mudrāṃ pradarśya raktavarṇavartulatejobimbamadhyasthaṃ raktavāsasaṃ śvetapadmopari sthitaṃ sarvābharaṇabhūṣitam ekavaktraṃ*

Somaśambhupaddhati, composed towards the end of the eleventh century.[40] The *Sāmbapurāṇa*, which teaches the worship of the Sun-god, is also a product, at least in its later portions, of a Śaiva environment.[41]

Traces of some form of the vanished tradition of the Sauras may have survived in the Śākta Śaiva literature. For Kashmirian sources know of a Śākta cult whose deity was the Sun under the name Vīra or Vīreśvara accompanied by the goddess Bhargaśikhā, citing as its scripture the Kaula *Bhargaśikhā*, also called *Saurabhargaśikhā*, a work for knowledge of whose content we now have only a few comments in the Kashmirian literature and a few verses quoted in the same, one of which has also been quoted by the east-Indian Buddhist Rāmapāla in his *Sekanirdeśapañjikā*, a fact that demonstrates that this was not a merely a local, Kashmirian tradition.[42] The probability that this cult reflects a non-

---

dvibhujaṃ śvetapaṅkajapāṇiṃ sarvalakṣaṇasampannaṃ saṃcintya puṣpair añjalim āpūrya OṂ HAṂ KHAṂ KHAṢOLKĀYA HRĀṂ HRĪṂ SAḤ SŪRYĀYA NAMAḤ *ity āvāhanamudrayā samāvāhya sthāpanyā saṃsthāpya saṃnidhā<pa>nyā saṃnidhāpya niṣṭhurayā nirodhyārghapādyācamanīyāni khaṣolkinā dattvā aṅgena mūlamantreṇa sāṅgaṃ sūryaṃ gandhapuṣpādibhiḥ saṃpūjya padmamudrāṃ bimbamudrāṃ ca pradarśyāgneyyāṃ* OṂ AṂ HṚDAYĀYA NAMAḤ, *aiśānyāṃ* OṂ ARKĀYA ŚIRASE SVĀHĀ, *nairṛtyāṃ* OṂ BHŪR BHUVAḤ SVAR *OṂ (em.: E B: AIḤ A) JVĀLINĪŚIKHĀYAI VAUṢAṬ, *vāyavyāṃ* OṂ HŪṂ KAVACĀYA HŪṂ, OṂ BHĀNUNETRĀYA VAṢAṬ *madhye, pūrvādicaturṣu digdaleṣu* OṂ RAḤ ASTRĀYA PHAṬ *ity aṅgāni saṃpūjya hṛdayādīnāṃ dhenuṃ netrasya gourṣāṃ trāsanīm astrasya ca pradarśya* OṂ SAṂ SOMĀYA NAMAḤ *pūrvadalāgre,* OṂ BUṂ BUDHĀYA NAMAḤ *dakṣiṇe,* OṂ BṚṂ BṚHASPATAYE NAMAḤ *paścime,* OṂ BHĀṂ BHĀRGAVĀYA NAMAḤ *uttare,* OṂ AṂ AṄGĀRĀYA NAMAḤ *āgneye,* OṂ ŚAṂ ŚANAIŚCARĀYA NAMAḤ *nairṛtyām,* OṂ RĀṂ RĀHAVE NAMAḤ *vāyavye,* OṂ KEṂ KETAVE NAMAḤ *īśānyām iti grahān saṃpūjya namaskāramudrayā prarocya gandhapuṣpadīpadhūpanaivedyādi khaṣolkinā dattvā padmamudrāṃ bimbamudrāṃ ca pradarśya kṣamasvety uccārya mantrasamūham upasaṃhṛtya saṃhāramudrayā dvādaśāntasthitasūryāya hṛtsthitāya vā niyojayet. ity anena vidhinā visarjya nirmālyam arghapātrodakaṃ ca aiśānyāṃ* TEJAŚCAṆḌĀYA NAMAḤ | *iti sūryapūjāvidhiḥ*. For some detailed evidence of the dependence of the *Somaśambhupaddhati* on the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 360 (fn. 28).

[40] *Somaśambhupaddhati*, Pt. I, pp. 68–89.

[41] HAZRA 1958, pp. 29–108; VON STIETENCRON 1966, pp. 227ff.

[42] See Abhinavagupta, *Mālinīślokavārtika* 1.161–162b (160c–161b: *yāvat tāvad tad ūrdhvordhvaṃ sroto yad bhedavarjitam* ‖ *saurabhargaśikhādīni tataḥ śāstrāṇi tenire*); *Tantrāloka* 4.255 and 15.280; 32.62: *vīrabhairavasaṃjñeyaṃ khecarī bodhavardhinī* | *aṣṭadhetthaṃ varṇitā śrībhargāṣṭakaśikhākule*; Kṣemarāja, *Sāmbapañcāśikāṭīkā* on *brahma prathamam atanu* in v. 10a: *prathamam ādāv atanu aśarīraṃ śrībhargaśikhādiṣṭanītyā akāraparāmarśātma vīreśvarākhyaṃ brahma bṛhad bṛṃhakaṃ ca paraṃ śāktaṃ dhāma* and on v. 21: *śrībhargaśikhāyām api "naiṣa varṇo na vā śabdo na caivāyaṃ kalātmakaḥ* | *kevalaḥ paramānando vīro nityodito raviḥ* ‖ *nāstam eti na codeti na śānto na vikāravān* | *sarvabhūtāntaracaro bhānur bharga iti smṛta" iti*; *Svacchandoddyota*, vol. 4 (Paṭala 9), p. 55, ll. 15–16; and Rāmapāla, *Sekanirdeśapañjikā*, f. 10v2–3: *tad uktaṃ bhargaśikhāyāṃ śākteye tantre na san na cāsat sadasan*

Śaiva tradition otherwise lost to us is made somewhat greater by the fact that the names Vīreśvara and Bhargaśikhā are applied in Kashmirian sources, both Śaiva and Smārta, to the Sun-god and his consort at Mārtāṇḍatīrtha (modern Maṭan), where King Lalitāditya built his majestic temple of the Sun in the mid-eighth century,[43] a site that has been a major pilgrimage site with its own special rites for the dead, the Bhargaśrāddha and Sūryabali, down to modern times.[44] However, it is possible that the application of these names merely reflects the pervasive influence of Śākta Śaiva esotericism in the wider Kashmirian community in later times.

There are also strong elements of a solar esotericism in the Kālīkula of the *Jayadrathayāmala* and the Krama.[45] It is possible that these too may have been

---

na tan nobhayojjhitam | *durvijñeyā hi sāvasthā kim apy etad anuttamam* (the verse has been silently incorporated by Abhinavagupta as *Tantrāloka* 2.28 [with *anuttaram* not *anuttamam*]): Jayaratha identifies this as a quotation from the *Bhargaśikhā* in his commentary: *śrībhargaśikhāṃ saṃvādayati* (*-viveka*, vol. 1, *Āhnika* 2, p. 22).

[43] *Rājataraṅginī* 4.192; Krishna DEVA in *EITA*, vol. 2, part 1, pp. 363–66; plates 710–721; *AIISPL*, Accession numbers 20738–20789 and 60003–60051. The *Mārtāṇḍamāhātmya*, the praise-text of this site, refers to Sūrya here as Vīreśvara (*Bhṛṅgīśasaṃhitā*, p. 15: *eṣa vīreśvaro devaḥ paraḥ paramakāraṇam*; p. 63: *vīreśāya namas tubhyaṃ*; p. 66: *namo vīrādhivīreśa*) and makes Bhargaśikhā the first of his Śaktis (*ibid.*, p. 12, listing Bhargaśikhā, Bhīmā, Bhāsvatī and Bhānavī). The Sun is also invoked as Vīreśvara in the worship of the Grahas that occurs among the preliminaries in Śaiva rituals in Kashmir; see *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* B f. 4v9–10: *tadbahir grahāḥ. tatrādau madhye sūryaḥ* OṂ RAṂ AGNAYE OṂ HRĀṂ HRĪṂ SAḤ VĪREŚVARĀYA NAMAḤ OṂ HRĀṂ HRĪṂ SAḤ VĪRALAKṢMYAI NAMAḤ. The Bījas HRĀṂ HRĪṂ SAḤ are Sūrya's. His consort is invoked as Vīralakṣmī here rather than as Bhargaśikhā because in the context of the ritual the pair are superimposed on the principal deities Amṛteśvara[bhairava] and his consort Amṛtalakṣmī.

[44] For the Paddhati of these rituals see *Karmakāṇḍa*, vol. 4, pp. 140–205. Here too the Sun is invoked as Vīra/Vīreśvara (p. 196): *vīra vīreśa deveśa namas te 'stu tridhātmaka* | *mahāmārtaṇḍa varada sarvābhayavarapradа* ....

[45] See, e.g, *Jayadrathayāmala* 4.4.8–17: *sa ravir bhāsurādhāras tadādhārā hi kālikā* | *ṣaḍare vipulādhārā ṣoḍaśoddyotasannibhā* ‖ 9 *sphuradvamanasaṅgrāsarāvikī sṛṣṭikārikā* | *sa ravir devatākāro ravir eka<s> tadākṛtiḥ* ‖ 10 *raviḥ pradīpakāloke sūryamadhyāt samutthitaḥ* | *raver antargato bhānur bhāsayaty akhilaṃ jagat* ‖ 11 *bhānavī kaulinī yā sā tatpuñjabharitaṃ jagat* | *tatrotpannā mahāmantrā bhairavāṣṭāṣṭayonayaḥ* ‖ 12 *na prakāśe na cākāśe nobhaye nobhayojjhite* | *sarvāvaraṇanirmukto sarvago bhāti bhāskaraḥ* ‖ 13 *amṛtaṃ prāvṛtaṃ yena racitaṃ ca kulākulam* | *sa raviḥ sūryaturyānte bhrājate raudraḍāmaraḥ* ‖ 14 *svasaṃvitparamādityanityoditamarīcibhiḥ* | *bhacakraṃ bhāsitaṃ yena sa vai kālañjaro bhavet*; *Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya*, ff. 30v7–21r4 (7.166–172 [Uttaragharāmnāya (Kālīkula) section]): 166 *raviḥ pradīpakāloke sūryamadhyād vinirgataḥ* | *raver antargato bhānur bhāsayaty akhilaṃ jagat* ‖ 167 *bhānavī kaulinī yā sā tatpuñjabharitaṃ jagat* | *tatrotpannā mahāmantrā bhairavāṣṭāṣṭayonayaḥ* ‖ 168 *ravibhānumayī devī kauleśī kulagahvarī* | *kṣobhānandavirāme tu paśyate kulasaṃtatim* ‖ 169 *mahāvyomārṇave śaive bhānavīkuṇḍamadhyataḥ* | *tatra pralīnāḥ sarve te bhairavāṣṭāṣṭayonayaḥ* ‖ 170 *bhānavīkuṇḍamadhye*

constructed on the basis of Saura notions. But it is also possible that they are an independent development internal to Śaivism. In the absence of properly Saura literature it is impossible to be sure.

The cult of the Sun-god, then, appears to have survived in India after the rise of the Śaivism only in heavily Śaivized Purāṇic reflexes or subordinated in a Śaivized form within the Saiddhāntika cult of Śiva, and, perhaps, in some elements within the Śākta Śaiva tradition. Only in the Majapahit kingdom of East Java do we hear of the survival of adherents of a distinct Saura denomination. There a royal charter of c. 1350 tells us that a board of six learned men appointed to adjudicate law suits included two adherents of this tradition.[46]

THE DECLINE OF VAIṢṆAVISM AND THE RISE OF THE TANTRIC PAÑCARĀTRA FOLLOWING ŚAIVA MODELS

Royal preference for Vaiṣṇavism, expressed in inscriptions by the epithets *atyantabhagavadbhaktaḥ*, *paramabhāgavataḥ*, or *paramavaiṣṇavaḥ*, all meaning 'entirely devoted to Viṣṇu', is mostly confined to the period from the fourth century to the seventh. The Bhāgavata faith was adopted and promoted by the Guptas from the first half of the fourth century through to the end of the fifth,[47] and it was probably under their influence that it gained a foothold in the fifth century among the Śaiva Vākāṭaka rulers of Nandivardhana in eastern Vidarbha, through the marriage in the last decade of the fourth century of the Vākāṭaka Rudrasena II to Prabhāvatīguptā, the daughter of the *paramabhāgavataḥ* Gupta emperor Candragupta II (c. 380–474).[48] Gupta influence may also explain the appearance of the Bhāgavata faith at the end of the fourth century among the Śālaṅkāyana kings of Veṅgīpura in Andhra. The earlier kings of this dynasty were devotees of Śiva in keeping with the norm in this region. But Nandivarman II, a younger contemporary of Candragupta II, is styled *paramabhāgavataḥ*.[49] Other early Vaiṣṇava kings are the Māṭharas of Kaliṅga,[50] the Traikūṭakas of Nāsik, Koṅkaṇa, and Lāṭa,[51] the Śarabhapurīyas of Dakṣiṇa Kosala,[52] and the Parivrājaka Mahārājas of Ḍabhālārājya (Ḍāhala) in the fifth and sixth centuries,[53] perhaps the early Maukharis of Kanyakubja before the reign of Īśānavarman (c. 550–76),[54] the Nalas of western Orissa (c. 450+–700),[55] the early Cālukyas of Vātāpi (Bādāmī) in the sixth and early seventh century,[56] and the early Pallavas of Kāñcī up to and including Siṃhaviṣṇu II (c. 550–610).[57] After Pulakeśin II and Siṃhaviṣṇu both the Cālukyas and Pallavas were Śaivas,[58] as

---

tu layacakraṃ svabhāvataḥ | vilīne svasvabhāvākhye tatsvabhāvodayaṃ tataḥ || 171 bhāvābhāvadvayottīrṇā yā virauty aśarīriṇī | sā cidā niḥsvabhāvasthā sūryākulā kṛśodarī || 172 tatsvarūpoditaṃ cakraṃ cidbhānvarkagatisthitam | pratibimbam ivābhāti viśvagrāsaikalampaṭam; *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva* 2.37cd: *bhāskarair dvidaśair yuktā śikhā bhargasya cottamā*; Eraka, *Kramastotra*, quoted in *Tantrālokaviveka* on 4.165c–167: *astoditadvādaśabhānubhāji yasyāṃ gatā bhargaśikhā śikheva | praśāntadhāmni dyutināśam eti tāṃ naumy anantāṃ paramārkakālīm*. On the literature of the Kashmirian Kālīkula see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 250–370.

[46] See here p. 120.

[47] *CII* 3:8, ll. 1–2: *paramabhāgavatamahārājādhirājaśrīkumāragupta-*; ll. 20–23: *paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśrīcandraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānuddhyāto mahādevyāṃ dhruvadevyām utpannaḥ paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśrīkumāraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānuddhyātaḥ paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśrīskandaguptaḥ*.

[48] On Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism among the Vākāṭakas of Nandivardhana and the influence of the Vaiṣṇava Prabhāvatīguptā on the religion of this dynasty see BAKKER 1997.

[49] *EI* 42:11, ll. 7–9: *bhagavaccitra<rathasvāmya>nuddhyāto ... paramabhāgavataś śālaṅkāyanavaṃśaprabhavo vijayavarmmā*. For this hypothesis of Gupta influence, which rests on slenderer evidence than that of Gupta influence on the Vākāṭakas, see S. SANKARANARAYANAN in *EI* 42:11, p. 92.

[50] TRIPATHY 1997:2: *bhagavatsvāminārāyaṇapādānudhyātaḥ*; 3: *nārāyaṇasvāminaḥ pādabhaktaḥ paramadaivata<ḥ>*.

[51] MIRASHI, *CII* 4i, p. xliv; *CII* 4i:8, ll. 1–2: *bhagavatpādakarmmakaro ... mahārājadahrasena<ḥ>*; *CII* 4i:9, ll. 1–2, 7–8: *bhagavatpādakarmmakaraḥ ... mahārājavyāghrasena<ḥ>*.

[52] *EI* 31:35, ll. 1–2: *EI* 22:6, ll. 3–4; *EI* 31:18, l. 3.

[53] *EI* 8:28.

[54] Of his predecessors Harivarman, Ādityavarman, and Īśvaravarman, we know that the second at least was *paramabhāgavataḥ*.

[55] *EI* 21:24 (Poḍāgaḍh inscription of the Nala Skandavarman, fifth century) and *EI* 26:3 (Rājim stome inscription of the Nala Vilāsatuṅga, c. 700); SINGH 1994, pp. 89–90.

[56] Kīrtivarman I (r. 566–597) completed the Viṣṇu cave-temple at Vātāpi. His successor Maṅgalīśvara-Raṇavikrānta (r. 597–608) is styled *paramabhāgavataḥ* in an inscription in the Vaiṣṇava cave 3 at Bādāmī recording the completion of the temple, the installation of the Viṣṇu, and the granting of a village (FLEET in BURGESS 1877, p. 363, ll. 5–10; and FLEET 1881 [lithograph]): *śrīmaṅgalīśvararaṇavikrāntaḥ ... paramabhāgavato *layanaṃ* (corr. FLEET: *layano* Ep.) *mahāviṣṇugṛham ... kṛtvā* .... On the Vaiṣṇavism of the early Cālukyas before Vikramāditya I (654–c. 681) see BOLON 1979, pp. 254–256.

[57] Cārudevī, wife of Buddhavarman son of Skandavarman I (c. 330–350) (MAHALINGAM 1988:4, ll. 7–9: gift of land to a temple of Nārāyaṇa); Siṃhavarman II, c. 436– 477 (MAHALINGAM 1988:8, ll. 15–17: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Yuvarāja Viṣṇugopa, mid-fifth century (MAHALINGAM 1988:6: ll. 9–17; MAHALINGAM 1988:7, ll. 18–21: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Nandivarman I, c. 495–520 (MAHALINGAM 1988:10, ll. 9–10: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Buddhavarman, father of Kumāraviṣṇu III (MAHALINGAM 1988:11, ll. 6–7: *bhagavadbhaktisambhāvitasarvakalyāṇasya*); Kumāraviṣṇu III c. 520– 540 (MAHALINGAM 1988:11, ll. 12–14: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Siṃhavarman III c. 540– 550 (MAHALINGAM 1988:12, ll. 14–18: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Siṃhaviṣṇu c. 550– 610 (MAHALINGAM 1988:76: *bhaktyārādhitaviṣṇuḥ siṃhaviṣṇuḥ*).

[58] For the Śaivism of Cālukya Pulakeśin II's successors Vikramāditya I (654–c. 681), Vinayāditya I (681–696), Vijayāditya (696–733), Vikramāditya II (733–744), and

were the later Maukharis.[59]

After the seventh century royal Vaiṣṇavism is sporadic, with the prominent exception of the Kārkoṭas of Kashmir (c. 625–855/6). The conclusion that this dynasty was Vaiṣṇava is not derived from our study of inscriptions, because extremely few have survived the centuries of Islamic rule in Kashmir, which began in 1339 and ended in 1819. It rests primarily on the testimony of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* of the Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa, who did have access to, and did utilize, the local epigraphic record of religious foundations and dynastic history.[60] From this work we can see that when a king of this dynasty established and enshrined a deity, generally with his own name (*svanāmnā*), it was always a Viṣṇu (-svāmin, -keśava), though sometimes images of the Sun-god or the Buddha were enshrined in addition. These royal Viṣṇus are the Durlabhasvāmin (4.6) of Durlabhavardhana (r.c. 626–662), the Tribhuvanasvāmin (4.78) of Candrāpīḍa (r.c. 712-720/1), the Muktasvāmin (4.188) of Lalitāditya-Muktāpīḍa (725-761/2), his silver Parihāsakeśava at his new town Parihāsapura (4.195, 202), his golden Muktākeśava (4.196, 201), and a Viṣṇu at his new town Darpitapura (4.183), the Vipulakeśava (4.484) of Jayāpīḍa (r. c. 773/4-804/5), and his Caturātmakeśava and Anantaśayana Viṣṇu at his new town Jayapura (4.508), the Amṛtakeśava established after his death by his mother Amṛtaprabhā to secure the rescue from hell that the sins of his later life had made his certain destiny (4.659), and the Viṣṇus established by each of the five uncles of Cippaṭajayāpīḍa, who ran the country for thirty-seven years during the reign of the puppet king Ajitāpīḍa (r.c. 813/4–850/1): Utpalasvāmin (4.695ab), Padmasvāmin (4.695cd), Dharmasvāmin (4.697ab), Kalyāṇasvāmin (6.697cd), and Mammasvāmin (4.698–699).

Kalhaṇa reports only one Śaiva foundation by a king of this dynasty, and this is a special case. For it was not the creation of a new Śiva with the king's name, but merely the building by Lalitāditya of a new stone temple to house the ancient Śiva Jyeṣṭheśvara at the site of Śiva Bhūteśvara (4.190) in the context of offerings to clear his debt to the latter incurred when he had appropriated the wealth of this temple to finance his military campaigns (4.189). Devotion to Viṣṇu was also the preference of Avantivarman (r. 855/6–883), the first king of the next dynasty, and in keeping with his personal faith he installed an Avantisvāmin before his consecration. But thereafter he showed himself a Śaiva in unison with the faith of his powerful minister Śūra, establishing a Śiva Avantīśvara and making donations to the Śivas of the national Śiva-temples, confessing to Śūra his long-hidden devotion to Viṣṇu only at death's door (5.43, 123–125).[61]

Vaiṣṇavism gained ground again only towards the end of our period, and in subsequent centuries.[62] Before that happened, while it remained in the shadow of Śaivism, it gave rise to a new literature of scriptural texts known collectively as the Pañcarātra, that was probably composed in and around Kashmir. A form of Vaiṣṇavism bearing this name is already mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.[63] It is very probable, therefore, that it was in existence well before the Śaiva Mantramārga. However, there is no evidence that this early Pañcarātra had a Tantric ritual system of the kind that characterizes the Saṃhitās of the surviving corpus of Pāñcarātrika scripture. It is highly probable in my view that those texts are rather the product of a thorough reformation in which Vaiṣṇavas followed the example of the already flourishing Śaiva Mantramārga in order to provide themselves with a substantially new ritual system that would enable them to compete more effectively with their rivals. [64]

Kīrtivarman II (744–c. 753/757) and their construction of the Śiva temples at Paṭṭadakal and Alampur see *EI* 32:21, *ARE* 159 of 1959–60, *EI* 35:16 and 3:1; and the excellent overview in DAGENS 1984, vol. 1, pp. 20–24.

[59] On the Śaiva affiliation of the Maukharis Īśānavarman, Śarvavarman, and Avantivarman see BAKKER and ISAACSON 2004, pp. 32–33; THAPLYAL 1985: B 2, ll. 19–20; B 3, ll. 7–8; B 5, ll. 7–8. Another lineage that may have been Vaiṣṇava up to the early seventh century before turning to Śaivism is that of the Varmans of Prāgjyotiṣa. Bhūtivarman of that line was *paramabhāgavataḥ* according to his Baḍagaṅgā rock inscription of 553/4 (*EI* 27:5, ll. 1–2): *śrī paramadaivataparamabhāgavatamahārājādhirājāśvamedhajājin[āṃ] śrībhūtivarmadevapādānāṃ*. But his great-great-grandson, Bhāskaravarman (r.c. 600–50), has been described in his Dūbī copper-plate inscription as having revived Śaivism; see SIRCAR 1983a:1, ll. 109–110): *lakṣmīḥ kṣībavilāsa[nīta]vidhinā saṃskṛtya ca svīkṛtā bhūyo yena maheśvarāśrayanayaḥ sphāyipratāpārciṣā.*

[60] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 1.15: *dṛṣṭaiś ca pūrvabhūbhartṛpratiṣṭhā*vāstuśāsanaiḥ* (conj. : *vastuśāsanaiḥ* Ed.) | *praśastipaṭṭaiḥ śāstraiś ca śānto 'śeṣabhramaklamaḥ* 'I have removed all the troublesome errors [of my predecessors] by consulting in person the charters that record the [temples and other] edifices founded and consecrated (*-pratiṣṭhāvāstu-*) by the kings of the past, [their] panegyric donative inscriptions, and works of scholarship'.

[61] For the remains of Avantivarman's Avantisvāmin and Avantīśvara temples, both built at Avantipura, see Krishna DEVA in *EITA* vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 368–373; plates 734–738 and 740–757.

[62] Vaiṣṇavas who left their mark in the domains of the major Śāstras, belles-lettres, and literary theory are few during our centuries. The shift in the fortunes of Vaiṣṇavism is marked by the emergence of such influential religious leaders as Rāmānuja (d. 1137), Madhva (probably 1238–1317), Nimbārka (thirteenth century), Viṣṇusvāmin (thirteenth century?), Vallabha, and Caitanya (both late fifteenth century). For an excellent survey of the history of these Vaiṣṇava traditions see COLAS 2003.

[63] *Mahābhārata* 12.322.24; 12. 326.100; 12.360.76;12.337.1; 12.370.59, 63, and 67.

[64] It was this tradition that was subsequently adapted in South India as the basis of texts such as the *Īśvarasaṃhitā*, *Pādmasaṃhitā*, and *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*, whose purpose, absent in the earlier Saṃhitās, was to provide scriptural authority for a Pāñcarātrika system of temple-worship.

I am led to this conclusion by the convergence of various considerations. Firstly, the ritual system prescribed in the Pañcarātra scriptures is remarkably close to that of the Śaiva Mantramārga in its repertoire, consisting principally of Maṇḍala initiation (*dīkṣā*), regular worship comprising Nyāsa, Pūjā, Japa and Homa, the periodic ritual of *pavitrāropaṇam*, special rites of Mantra-propitiation (*mantrārādhanam*), and image-installation (*pratiṣṭhā*); and this proximity extends into the minute details of the procedures of these rituals and even to the production of Vaiṣṇava versions of such eminently Śaiva rites as the *vetālasādhanam*.[65]

Secondly, I see no evidence that any of the surviving Pañcarātra texts goes back as far the Śaiva texts that they so closely resemble. Seven can be shown to be relatively old because they have been cited by authors of the tenth century or have come down to us in early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. These are the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*, the *Devāmṛtapañcarātra*, the *Vāsudevakalpa* of the *Mahālakṣmīsaṃhitā*, the *Jayottara*, the *Jayākhya*, the *Sātvata*, and the *Pauṣkara*. Now, of these, three, namely the *Jayottara*, the *Jayākhya*, and the *Sātvata*, are very unlikely to have been produced before the ninth century, that is to say, at a time when the Śaiva Mantramārga had been flourishing under widespread royal patronage for at least two centuries and had been existence in some form by a time no later than the middle of the sixth and perhaps as early as the middle of the fifth. For all three focus on the worship of a form of Vāsudeva, called Vaikuṇṭha in the *Jayākhya* and *Jayottara* and Śaktyātman or Śaktīśa in the *Sātvatasaṃhitā*, in which the principal anthropomorphic face is flanked by the faces of Narasiṃha and Varāha, with a fourth face, that of the sage Kapila, at the rear.[66] Surviving stone and bronze images of this deity are numerous, but they are three-faced, lacking the face of Kapila at the rear, until the ninth century.[67]

Thirdly, these early Pañcarātra texts show clear signs of having drawn on Śaiva sources. This is particularly obvious in the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*, to which we have access in a single, incomplete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript bearing a date of transcription that falls in A.D. 1026.[68] The principal Mantra of

---

[65] A *vetālasādhanam* is taught in *Jayottara* 8.23–26b.

[66] *Jayākhyasaṃhitā* 6.73c–64 (JS) (=*Jayottara* 1.20 [J]): *dhyāyec caturbhujaṃ* **vipra* (JS:*devaṃ* J) *śaṅkhacakragadādharam* ‖ *caturvaktraṃ sunayanaṃ sukāntaṃ padmapāṇinam* | *vaikuṇṭhaṃ *narasiṃhāsyaṃ* (JS:*nārasiṃhaṃ ca* J) *vārāhaṃ kapilānanam*; *Sātvatasaṃhitā* 12.9, 14c–15: *śaktīśo 'py atha saṃcintyaḥ puṇḍarīkanibhekṣaṇaḥ* | *icchārūpadharaś caiva saumyaḥ prahasitānanaḥ* ‖ *... nārasiṃhena vaktreṇa bhavabhītivighātakṛt* ‖ *puṣṇāti sarvabhūtāni vārāheṇāmṛtātmanā* | *kurute paścimasthena kāpilenopasaṃhṛtim*.

[67] See SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 283–284, drawing on SIUDMAK 1994.

[68] *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*, exposure 11b3: *saṃvat 147 āṣāḍhaśukla ekādaśyāṃ*

this text, which may well be the oldest of the seven, is the well-known Vaiṣṇava Dvādaśākṣara OṂ NAMO BHAGAVATE VĀSUDEVĀYA NAMAḤ. But the principal among its ancillary Mantras are five that it calls the Brahmas. These are manifestly adapted from the venerable Śaiva Mantras of that name.[69]

---

*śukradine +++ nakṣatre *likhitam* (corr.:*likṣatam* Cod.) *iti* 'Copied on Friday, under the asterism +++, on the eleventh Tithi of the bright half of the month Āṣāḍha in the [expired] year 147'. That the unstated era of this date is the Newari, which began on 20 October, 879, is confirmed by palaeographical comparison with other Nepalese manuscripts of the early eleventh century. I am very grateful to Dr. Diwakar Acharya for providing me with a digital copy of this manuscript and his own transcription, and also for the information that a second manusript of this text photographed by the NGMPP (B 237/16) is merely a copy of the first. The title *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* appears nowhere in the surviving folios but is reconstructed here from the analytic equivalent seen in the colophon of the eighth Adhyāya: *iti pañcarātre *svāyambhuve* (corr.:*svayaṃbhuve* Cod.) *aṣṭamo <'>dhyāya<ḥ>*. The other surviving Adhyāya colophons refer to the work simply as *pañcarātram* or *pañcarātraṃ mahājñānam*. The meaning is 'the *Pañcarātra* of the Self-born', i.e. 'the *Pañcarātra* taught to Brahmā'. The text is indeed instruction given in response to questions posed by Brahmā. The instructor is Śiva/Īśvara. Exposure 3a1–2 (the beginning): OṂ NAMO BHAGAVATE VĀSUDEVĀYA ‖ *...praṇipatya haraṃ deva<ṃ> ...stutvā nāmasahasreṇa brahmā vacanaṃ abravīt*; exposure 4a2–3: **brahmaṇo vacanaṃ* (em.:*brahmācanaṃ* Cod.) *śrutvā īśvara<ḥ> *pratyabhāṣata* (em.:*pratyubhāṣyate* Cod.) | *śṛṇu brahma<n> prayatnena viṣṇo<ḥ> sthāpanam uttamam* | *pañcarātramahājñānaṃ sarvaśā[streṣu] cottamam*.

The *Devāmṛtapañcarātra*, which is closely related textually to the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* and is probably dependent on it, survives in a single, undated Nepalese manuscript, probably of the twelfth century. Here too I am indebted to Dr. Diwakar Acharya, who provided me with a transcript that he has prepared.

[69] The five Vaiṣṇava Brahmas are as follows (*Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*, exposure 10a1–2): OṂ NAREṆAREṆARAṆṆĀTHA NARA YASMĀN NAROTTAMA *prathamabrahmā* | OṂ YAJÑĀYA NAMO YĀNĀYA DHARMĀYA NAMAḤ *PUṆYĀYA (corr.:PUNYĀYA Cod.) NAMAḤ | VRATĀYA NAMAḤ | NIYAMĀYA NAMAḤ | MĀRGĀNUSĀRIṆE NAMAḤ *dvitīyabrahmā* | OṂ KĀLEBHYO *'THA KĀLEBHYAḤ (corr. : THA KĀLABHYA Cod.) KĀLAKĀLĀNTAREBHYAŚ CA SARVVATA [+ + + + + NA]MAS TE RUDRARUDREBHYAḤ *tṛtīya brahmā* | OṂ TATSAṂYOGĀYA VIDMAHE HṚŚĪKESĀYA *DHĪMAHI (corr.:DHĪTMAHE Cod.) TAN NO *VIṢṆUḤ (corr.:VIṢṆU Cod.) PRACODAYĀT *caturthabrahmā* | RODHAKA SARVVAVIDYĀNĀṂ DEVADĀNAVĀDHIPATI MAHĀPURUṢA NAMO STU TE *pañca<ma>brahmā*. The four Brahmas after the first are evidently modelled on the Śaiva Brahmas in the order (1) Vāmadeva (VĀMADEVĀYA NAMO JYEṢṬHĀYA NAMO RUDRĀYA NAMAḤ KĀLĀYA NAMAḤ KALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAPRAMATHANĀYA NAMAḤ SARVABHŪTADAMANĀYA NAMO MANONMANĀYA NAMAḤ), (2) Aghora (AGHOREBHYO 'THA GHOREBHYO GHORAGHORATAREBHYAŚ CA SARVATAḤ ŚARVA SARVEBHYO NAMAS TE RUDRARŪPEBHYAḤ), (3) Tatpuruṣa (TATPURUṢĀYA VIDMAHE MAHĀDEVĀYA DHĪMAHI TAN NO RUDRAḤ PRACODAYĀT), and (4) Īśāna (ĪŚĀNAḤ SARVAVIDYĀNĀM ĪŚVARAḤ SARVABHŪTĀNĀṂ BRAHMAṆO 'DHIPATIR BRAHMĀ ŚIVO ME 'STU SADĀ ŚIVAḤ). The first Brahma has nothing in common with the remaining Śaiva Brahma, that of Sadyojāta.

The Śaiva prototypes are already found in the Atimārga of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas. Indeed they constitute the whole Mantra-system of that tradition. However, it is clear that the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* has drawn them from the later tradition of the Mantramārga, because it goes on to teach the imposition on to the worshipper's body of the thirty-eight parts of these Mantras (*kalānyāsaḥ*), a Mantramārgic feature, and under names specific to one Mantramārgic tradition, that of the *Svacchandatantra*, the principal scripture of the Mantrapīṭha.[70]

The *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* survives only in this Nepalese manuscript. One might object, therefore, that it may be no more than a local oddity unrepresentative of the mainstream tradition. That it is not can be argued, of course, only through evidence that the text was more widely known in the form of references to it, citations from it, or accounts of its contents in other works. This is a difficult test to apply in the case of the early Pāñcarātrika literature, since in stark contrast to the case of the Śaiva scriptures, Pāñcarātrika commentarial works in which we could seek such evidence are almost completely absent until a much later period among the Śrīvaiṣṇavas of the South, when the range of relevant sources had changed greatly. The only exception is the *Spandapradīpikā* of the Kashmirian Bhāgavatotpala, probably of the tenth century.[71] But that, though it cites a number of early Pāñcarātrika scriptural sources, does not cite this. However, there is evidence in a Śaiva source that this Pāñcarātrika text was known and followed outside Nepal. For I propose that it is identical with the *Svayambhūpañcarātra* that Somaśambhu cites as his authority in his account of the procedures for the installation of an image of Viṣṇu in the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*,[72] the highly influential work on the Saiddhāntika Śaiva rituals[73] that he composed in the eleventh century, probably in 1073,[74] while he held the office of abbot in the kingdom of the Kalacuris of Tripurī at the illustrious Saiddhāntika monastery of Golagī (*golagīmaṭhaḥ*), in the Rewa District of Madhya Pradesh.[75]

My conclusion that Somaśambhu was referring to our *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* does not rest solely on the synonymity of the titles, both meaning 'The Pañcarātra taught to Brahmā', but also on the fact that the brief but detailed account of the ritual that Somaśambhu attributes to the *Svayambhūpañcarātra* corresponds in its particulars to the coverage of the same topic found in the seventh Adhyāya of the text in our manuscript. I cannot demonstrate this in full detail here. But it should suffice to point out that the system that Somaśambhu attributes to his *Svayambhūpañcarātra* features an unusual arrangement of three circuits of Mantra-deities that agrees exactly with that of our *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* manuscript: nine on a lotus with eight petals (one at the centre and one on each of the petals), twelve in a circle with that lotus at its centre, and eight forming a circuit enclosing the whole. The twelve are the Viṣṇumūrtis, embodying each of the twelve syllables of the root-Mantra (*mūlamantraḥ*); the outer eight are the eight weapons (*astrāṇi*) held by the presiding deity; and the nine of the innermost circuit (*garbhāvaraṇam*) are a set of ancillary Mantras: the Hṛdaya at the centre surrounded by the Śiras (E), the Śikhā (S), the Kavaca (W), the Astra (N), the Gāyatrī (SE), the Sāvitrī (NE), the Netra (SW), and the Piṅgalāstra (NW).[76] Since this arrangement is highly unusual, especially in its set of nine ancillaries, it is extremely unlikely that Somaśambhu's *Svayambhūpañcarātra* is not the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* of the Nepalese manuscript. Since Somaśambhu was a major figure and writing far from Nepal for a pan-Indian audience there are no grounds for considering this tradition to be a Nepalese aberration.

---

[70] Ibid., exposure 10a3–5: *kalānyāsaṃ caturthan tu | śṛṣṭi vṛrddhi mati lakṣmī medhā kānti svadhā sthitā | rajo rakṣū rati pēlyā kāmā tṛṣṇā mati jñayā | avidhi kāya tāta ca bhrāmaṇī mohanī tathā | + + + + + + + sthāḥ kṣudhā mṛtyu jvarabhayā | nirvitiś ca pratiṣṭhā ca | śānti vidyā tathaiva ca | tarā sutārā taraṇī tārayanti svatāraṇī | aṣṭatriṅśa*kalopeta* (em. :*kalāpetaḥ* Cod.) *ācāryaḥ *samudāhṛtaḥ* (corr.:*samudāhṛtāḥ* Cod.). Cf., to emend the names, *Svacchandatantra* 1.53–59b (/*Svacchandalalitabhairava* IFI T. 507, p. 6; NAK MS 1–224, f.3v4–4r1, the latter with different *kalāḥ* of Īśana) and *Netratantra* 22.26–34.

[71] I am aware of no reference to the *Spandapradīpikā* or its author in any dated work. It is not possible, therefore, to fix a date before which this work must have been written, at least not a date earlier than that of its manuscripts. However, the fact that it quotes extensively from the Śākta Śaiva literature current in Kashmir up to and including the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* of Utpaladeva (*fl. c.* 925–975) but not from any of the works of Abhinavagupta (*fl. c.* 975–1025) makes it unlikely that its author wrote after the latter.

[72] Verse 4.12ab in BRUNNER's edition (*Somaśambhupaddhati*, Pt. 4, p. 297) (B), = verse 1668cd in the KSTS edition (*Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī*) (K), and folio 71v2–3 in the Cambridge MS (*Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*) (C): *svayambhū*pañcarātre* (NK:*pāñcarātre* B) *ca sarvam etad udīritam.*

[73] Of the various Paddhatis on the Saiddhāntika rituals that have come down to us Somaśambhu's was probably the most influential. Its impact can be seen in the major later works of this type, such as the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva, the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva, and the *Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha, and in the fact that manuscripts of the text have survived throughout the subcontinent, in Kashmir, Nepal, and the South. There is also the fact that it alone achieved the distinction of being stripped of its human authorship to be passed off as scripture. For it was incorporated almost in its entirety in the *Agnipurāṇa* (SANDERSON in BRUNNER 1998, p. lix, fn. 81); and much of it was taken over in the late south-Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures *Cintyaviśvasādākhya* and *Uttarakāmika* (BRUNNER 1998, p. lviii–lix).

[74] For a discussion of the date of Somaśambhu's Paddhati see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 420–421, footnote 640.

[75] For the name Golagī and the location of the monastery see here p. 264.

[76] The relevant passage in the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* (exposure 5b3–5a2) is as follows (with some restorations and emendations following the readings of a closely related passage in the eleventh Adhyāya of the *Devāmṛtapañcarātra* [D]): **yajanaṃ* (em. D and here, exposure 8a3:++ *naṃ* Cod.) *saṃpravakṣyāmi *divyaṃ* (D:*devaṃ* Cod.) *nārāyaṇasya *tu* (D:*tuḥ* Cod.) | *tribhir āvaraṇaiḥ *kāryaṃ* (em.:*kāya* Cod.:*kārā* D) *durlabhaṃ *tu surāsuraiḥ* (D:*sasurāsuraṃ* Cod.) | *madhye cakraṃ *pratiṣṭhāpyaṃ* (em.:*pratiṣṭhāyāṃ* Cod.:*pratiṣṭhāpya* D) **dvādaśāraṃ* (corr. [D: *arai<r> dvādaśabhir yutam*]:*dvādaśāna* Cod.) *suśobhanam* | *tanmadhye ka-*

Furthermore, while the ritual systems taught in the scriptures of the Pañcarātra are generally coherent, no less so than those of the Śaivas, the texts retain elements that make sense in the Śaiva world but not in the Vaiṣṇava;

---

malam proktaṃ patrāṣṭakasakarṇikam | *sarvātmā *sakalo* (em.:*sakalā* Cod.) **devo* (corr.:*deva* Cod.) **divyamālāsasamanvitaḥ* (conj.:*divyamālāsanātanaḥ* Cod.) | *śriyā madhye tu hṛdayaṃ hūṃkāreṇa tu pūjayet* | *śira<ḥ> pūrvadale *dadyād dakṣiṇe tu śikhāṃ* (D:*da + + + + + + + ṃ* Cod.) *nyaset* | *paścime kavacaṃ *dadyād* (corr.:*dadyāv* Cod.) *astrañ caivottareṇa tu* | *gāyatry āgneyadig*bhāge* (corr.:*bhāga* Cod.) *sāvitrīm īśvare svayaṃ* | **netrañ* (corr.:*netrāñ* Cod.) *caiva tu *nairṛtyāṃ* (corr.:*nairityāṃ* Cod.) *piṅgalāstraṃ tu *vāyave* (corr.:*vāyavet* Cod.) | *guhyād guhyataraṃ guhyaṃ garbhāvaraṇam uttamaṃ* | **dvitīyaṃ* (corr.:*dvitīyāṃ* Cod.) **sampravakṣyāmi* (corr.:*sampravakṣyāmiḥ* Cod.) *viṣṇu*mūrtīḥ* (corr.:*mūrtti* Cod.) *prapūjayet* | *dvādaśāre tathā cakre nyase<d> dvādaśa mūrtayaḥ* | **keśavaṃ tu are pūrve oṃkāreṇa* (D:*ke ++++++++++ reṇa* Cod.) *tu pūjayet* | *dvitīyan tu ṇakāreṇa *pūjya* (conj.:*jñeyāṃ* Cod.) *nārāyaṇan *tathā* (corr.:*tathāḥ* Cod.) | *tṛtīyaṃ mādhavaṃ *pūjya* (em. : *pūjyaṃ* Cod.) *mokāreṇa *mahātmanā* (D:*mahātmanaḥ* Cod.) | *bhakārākṣaradevena govindan tu *caturthakam* (D:*caturthakaiḥ* Cod.) | *pañcaman tu gakāreṇa viṣṇu<ṃ> caiva prapūjayet* | *vakārākṣaradevena ṣaṣṭhe vai madhusūdanam* | *saptame vāmanañ *caiva* (corr.:*caivaḥ* Cod.) *tekāreṇa tu pūjaye[t]* | **yajed vākārabījena* (conj.:+ *j* . *dvārabījena* Cod.) *aṣṭame tu *trivikramam* (corr.:*trivikramaḥ* Cod.) | *śrīdharan navamañ caiva sukāreṇa tu pūjayet* | *daśame tu hṛṣīkeśaṃ dekāreṇa tu pūjayet* | *ekādaśe tu *vākāre* (conj.:*vākāra* Cod.) *padmanābhaṃ *prabhuṃ* (corr. *prabhu* Cod.) *vid··ḥ* | *dvādaśe <tu> bhakāreṇa nāmnā dāmodaraṃ smṛtam* | **dvitīyāvaraṇaṃ khyātaṃ* (D:*dvitīyāvaraṇa khyātāṃ* Cod.) **tṛtīye 'strāṇi* (D:*tṛtīyena strāni* Cod.) *vinyaset* | *śaṅkha<ṃ> caiva nyase<t> *pūrve* (em.:*pūrvvaṃ* Cod.) **āgneyyāṃ tu gadāṃ nyaset* (D:*āgneyā +++++* Cod.) | **dakṣiṇena* (corr.:+ *kṣiṇena* Cod.) *bhave<c> cakraṃ khaḍgaṃ *nairṛtyagocare* (corr.:*nairityagocaret* Cod.) | *padma<ṃ> paścimato vidyā<d> vāyavyaṃ tu hala<ṃ> nyaset* | *musala<ṃ> *cottarato* (em. in spite of the metre:*cottato* Cod. D) *dadyād īśānyā<ṃ> *śārṅga* (corr.:*sārāṅga* Cod.) *vinyaset* | *etad guhyataraṃ *yāgaṃ* (corr.:*yāgāṃ* Cod.) *durlabhaṃ paramam padaṃ*. Somaśambhu sets out the same material in his Paddhati in 4.27c–33 of BRUNNER's edition, =vv. 1681c–1686 in the Kashmirian edition, and f. 72r2–7 in the Cambridge manuscript (the last two sources offer no significant variants but only minor errors and corruptions that I have not recorded here): *vinyasya cāditaś cakraṃ dvādaśāraṃ subhāsvaram* || 28 *tasya madhye punar deyaṃ padmam aṣṭadalaṃ tataḥ* | *hṛnmantraṃ karṇikāyāṃ ca śiraḥ pūrvadale tataḥ* || 29 *śikhāṃ ca dakṣiṇe patre paścime kavacaṃ nyaset* | *astram uttarato nyasya gāyatrīm agnipatrake* || 30 *sāvitrīm īśapatre ca netraṃ ca nairṛte dale* | *tataś ca vāyupatre ca piṅgalāstraṃ vinikṣipet* || 31 *garbhāvaraṇam ity uktam adhunāvaraṇāntaram* | *dvādaśāre ca cakre 'smin keśavādyān yathākramam* || 32 *praṇavādyair yathākāram uktapūrvaiḥ svanāmabhiḥ* | *prāgāditaś ca vinyasya khaḍgaṃ gadām anantaram* || 33 *cakraṃ śaṅkhaṃ ca padmaṃ ca halaṃ ca musalaṃ tataḥ* | *śārṅgaṃ ca vinyased evaṃ tṛtīyāvaraṇaṃ bhavet*.

and in some cases we find a degree of awkwardness that is consistent only with a clumsy attempt to adapt Śaiva materials to their new context.

A striking example of this can be seen in the *Jayākhya*. When detailing the process of initation it describes the *pāśasūtram*, the cord which is ritually transformed into a substitute of the subtle body of the candidate, containing all the reality-levels along its length, to be used in the process of rendering the past actions that bind his soul incapable of giving rise to future consequences at any of these levels. In the course of this description we find some elements alien to the Vaiṣṇava tradition that derive, with minimal distortion, from the Śaiva doctrinal context. Thus it speaks of this cord as embodying *kalā*, *avidyā*, and *rāgaḥ*, and, shortly afterwards, as coloured by *rāgaḥ*, illuminated by *avidyā*, circumscribed by *kālaḥ*, and rendered non-pervasive by *niyatiḥ*.[77] Now the first three of these factors (*rāgaḥ*, *avidyā*, and *kalā*) are the Śaiva Mantramārga's three 'shrouds'

---

[77] The only edition of the *Jayākhya* (Ed.), that of KRISHNAMACHARYYA, was based on south-Indian manuscripts of relatively recent date. I re-edit the text of the passage to which I am referring, 16.128c–134 [numeration of Ed.], with the help of the testimony of a Nepalese paper manuscript of 1454/5 (N), ff. 35v7–36r4, and a lemma in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of 1187/8 of the *Jñānalakṣmī* of Sādhaka Candradatta, pupil of Ekāyanācārya Nārāyaṇagarbha (C): *susitaṃ sūtram ādāya lākṣālaktakabhāvitam* || 129 *saṃmukhaṃ cotthitaṃ śiṣyaṃ *samapādaśirodharam* (corr. [=C]:*śemapādaśirodharam* N : *samapādaśironnatam* Ed.) | *kṛtvāṅguṣṭhadvayasyāgrāt samārabhya *dvijottama* (Ed.:*dvijottamaḥ* N) || 130 *yāvac chikhāvasānaṃ tu sūtra*mānaṃ* (Ed.:*māna* N) *samāharet* | *kuryād *ekaguṇaṃ* (Ed.:*vekaguṇaṃ* N) *tad *vai* (Ed.:*ve* N) *dviguṇaṃ triguṇaṃ tu vā* || 131 **tris tris tad* (conj.:*tristrismad* N:*tritristha* Ed.) *guṇitam vātha *pañcaviṃśatidhāthavā* (N:*pañcaviṃsati cāthavā* Ed.) | *avyaktaliṅgasūtraṃ tu *tad rāgāvidyākalātmakam* (em.:*tadrāgrāvidyākalātmakam* N:*prāgavidyakalātmakam* Ed.) || 132 **nityaṃ jaḍaṃ* (Ed.:*nityajaḍe* N) *vyāpakaṃ ca tasmin viśvam pratiṣṭhitam* | **tatraivāstaṃ vrajed* (corr.:*tatrevāstam vrajed* N:*tatrāptam ayate* Ed.:*tatrāstam ayate* conj. KRISHNAMACHARYYA) *bhūyas tasmād eva pravartate* || 133 *tatrasthāṃ cintayet sarvām abhinnāṃ tattvapaddhatim* | **tattvodbhavās* (N:*tatrodbhavās* Ed.) *tu ye vipra *pāśā* (em.:*pāśa* Ed.:*teṣām* Ed.) *bandhātmakā dṛḍhāḥ* || 134 *rāgeṇa rañjitāś *citrā* (Ed:*ciṃtā* N) *avidyāsaṃpradīpitāḥ* | *vicchinnāś caiva kālena *niyatyāvyāpakās* (conj.:*niyatāvyāpakās* N Ed.) *tathā* 'O best of brahmins, after taking up a perfectly white cord soaked [red] with lac and making the candidate stand facing him with his feet together and his head upright, he should measure out [a length of] the cord from the tip of his two big toes to his hair-tuft. He may make [the cord of this length] single, double, triple, thrice triple, or twenty-fivefold. He should meditate upon the entire sequence of Tattvas as residing undivided therein. This thread, [which embodies] the subtle body [of the candidate], comprises Rāga, Avidyā, and Kalā (*rāgāvidyākalātmakam*). It is eternal, unconscious, and pervasive. The whole universe is grounded in it. Into it it disappears again and from it alone it comes forth. These binding cords are the firm fetters [of the soul]. They arise, O brahmin, from the Tattvas. They are coloured because they have been dyed with [the redness of] Rāga. They are illuminated by Avidyā, circumscribed by Kāla, and made non-pervasive by Niyati'.

(*kañcukāni*), except that there the second is generally termed *vidyā* rather than *avidyā*; and the other two factors, *kālaḥ* and *niyatiḥ* join these three to form the group of five reality-levels (*tattvāni*) ranked immediately below *māyātattvam*, the upper limit and source of the 'impure cosmos' (*aśuddho 'dhvā*), and immediately above the individual soul (*puruṣaḥ*), constituting the factors that enable the soul to undergo embodiment in that impure world.[78] Even the substitution of *avidyā* for the Śaivas' *vidyā* does nothing to dilute the obviously Śaiva character of the set, since *vidyā* in that context is indeed a form of nescience (*avidyā*), being understood as the limited power of knowledge that characterizes bound souls, enabling them to cognize the objects presented by the faculties, as opposed to the pure, all-encompassing knowledge (*śuddhavidyā*) that operates above *māyātattvam*; and this understanding is maintained in the passage in the *Jayākhya*, because it speaks of the bonds as being 'illuminated' by *avidyā*. Indeed the line in which the bonds are said to be 'coloured by *rāgaḥ* and illuminated by *avidyā*' unmistakeably echoes *loci classici* on the functions of *rāgaḥ* and *vidyā* in the Mantramārga's scriptures.[79]

The *Sātvata* and the *Pauṣkara* are probably the latest of these early texts. They are certainly the most polished and the most sophisticated in language. Unsurprisingly, these more mature products of the tradition contain no glaringly obvious examples that I can see of imperfectly assimilated Śaiva material. Nonetheless, there are parallels in which the Śaiva version seems more likely to have been the model of the Pāñcarātrika than *vice versa*. Thus the nineteenth chapter of the *Pauṣkara* teaches as the text's major initiation Maṇḍala (*mahāyāgaḥ*) an arrangement of eight lotuses around a central ninth, calling it the *navapīṭhamaṇḍalam*, *navābjamaṇḍalam*, or *navanābhamaṇḍalam*,[80] and a long invocatory Mantra consisting of eighty-one units distributed one by one on the centre (*nābhiḥ*) and eight petals of each of the nine lotuses. This arrangement and correlation, which, to my knowledge, is found in the Pāñcarātrika literature only in the *Pauṣkara*, is central to the Śaiva tradition of the Mantramārga, being the hallmark of a number of its earlier scriptures, where the Maṇḍala is taught under the same names,[81] and the Mantra with which it is correlated is the well-known Śaiva Vyomavyāpimantra of eighty-one units. In the Śaiva case the nine lotus-thrones (*pīṭhaḥ*) of the Maṇḍala are equated with nine Tattvas: Śiva, Sadāśiva, Īśvara, Vidyā, Māyā, Kāla, Niyati, Puruṣa, and Avyakta (Prakṛti). In the *Pauṣkara* that element has been dropped, no Vaiṣṇava set of nine Tattvas being available for this purpose and the Śaiva set being unassimilable because it includes unmistakeably Śaiva elements such as Sadāśiva and Īśvara. Nonetheless the text contains a sign that the redactor was after all working with a Śaiva exemplar. For he calls his fourth 'the lotus of Māyā'.[82] Māyā is a Śaiva not a Pāñcarātrika Tattva.

Furthermore, in the *Pauṣkara*, the *Sātvata*, and the *Vāsudevakalpa* of the *Mahālakṣmīsaṃhitā* we find the term *spandaḥ* 'vibrancy' in the sense it has in the Śākta Śaiva *Jayadrathayāmala* and the *Spandākārikā* of Kallaṭa in the second half of the ninth century. However, I do not exclude the possibility that in this case it may be the Śaiva sources that are indebted to the Vaiṣṇava.[83]

---

[78] For *rāgaḥ*, *vidyā*, and *kalā* as the three 'shrouds' (*kañcukatrayam*) of the Śaivas see, e.g., *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 11.33: *rāgavidyākalākhyena kañcukatritayena vai*; and *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* 1.3–4: *rāgavidyākalāvyaktaguṇabuddhisamudbhavam*, where they are the three 'shrouds' (*kañcukāni*) of the bound soul. For the addition of *kālaḥ* and *niyatiḥ* seen in the last verse of the *Jayākhya* passage (16.134) see, e.g., *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 14.2: *kañcukatritayāviddhaṃ kālena kalitaṃ śanaiḥ | niyatyāliṅgitaṃ yāti puṃbhāvenātmavartinā*; and *Tantrāloka* 9.204: *māyā kalā rāgavidye kālo niyatir eva ca | kañcukāni ṣaḍ uktāni.*

[79] Cf. *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 32.10–11: *kalodbalitacaitanyo vidyādarśitagocaraḥ | rāgeṇa rañjitaś cāpi buddhyādikaraṇais tataḥ || māyādyavaniparyantatattvabhūtātmavartmani | bhuṅkte tatra sthito bhogān bhogaikarasikaḥ pumān*; *Kiraṇa* 1.16c–17a: *tayodbalitacaitanyo vidyākhyāpitagocaraḥ rāgena rañjitaś cāpi*; and *Kubjikāmata* 13.3: *rāgeṇa rañjitātmā vai niyatyā yo niyāmitaḥ avidyāprerito gacchet svargaṃ vā svabhram eva vā.*

[80] *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 1.24ab: *yady ekaṃ tu mahāyāgaṃ navanābhaṃ samudyajet*; 10.34cd: *navapīṭhe mahāyāge taṃ ca kṛtsnaṃ vadāmi te*; 19.26: *yair uddiṣṭaṃ mahāyāge navābje.*

[81] *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Kriyāpāda* 1.51c: *maṇḍalaṃ navapīṭhākhyaṃ*; Kṣemarāja, *Svacchandoddyota* vol. 2 (Paṭala 5), p. 22: *navanābhaṃ navanābhisthānasthapadmam etat puramaṇḍalam.* Cf. *Niśvāsaguhya* 11.14ab (*Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* f. 83v1): *ekāśītipado yāgo navavyūheti *saṃjñitaḥ* (conj.: *saṃsthitaḥ* Cod.).

[82] *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 19.24c–26b, 27ab, 31ab, 37c–38b: *jñātum icchāmi *vidyākhyamantrāṇāṃ* (*vidyākhya* em.: *vidyākhyaṃ* Ed.) *lakṣaṇaṃ vibho || 25 yaiḥ padmakalpanā kāryā *padair* (conj.: *padmair* Ed.) *nirvartitaiḥ prabho | brahmaprakāśakānāṃ tu mantrāṇām atha lakṣaṇam || 26 yair uddiṣṭaṃ mahāyāge navābje pūjanaṃ tathā | ... 27 madhyapadme padānāṃ ca navakaṃ parikīrtitam | ... 31 māyāmaye 'tha* (conj. *'nte* Cod.) *kamale caturthe tu padaṃ smṛtam | ... iti vidyāpadānāṃ ca svarūpeṇa prakāśitam || 38 atha brahmapadānāṃ ca lakṣaṇaṃ cāvadhāraya.*

[83] See *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 27.274–276: *śāntasaṃvitsvarūpasya spandānandamayātmanaḥ | tavācyutaṃ hi citspandaṃ svayaṃ pariṇataṃ smaret || 275 sahasraśaśisūryāgniprabhayā projjvalaṃ sthiram | marīcicakrasaṃpūrṇacidgarbhaṃ sarvatomukham || 276 cidambarāntarāvasthaṃ suśāntaṃ bhagavatpadam*; *Sātvatasaṃhitā* 3.15cd: *evaṃ jñātvā sthitiṃ brāhmīṃ svānandāspandalakṣaṇām* (conj.: *svānandaṃ spandalakṣaṇām* Ed.); also 5.99–101b: *lolībhūtam abhedena smaret turyātmanā purā | nityoditaṃ ca supade sthitam aspandalakṣaṇam || 100 athārcituṃ yam icchet tu viśeṣavyaktilakṣaṇam | saṃkalpya tu svabuddhyā tu tatkālasamanantaram || 101 dhruvā sāmarthyaśaktir vai spandatām eti ca svayam*; *Vāsudevakalpa* at 165ab: *cicchaktau tu layaṃ kṛtvā svānandāspandagocare*; 238–241b: *mānasena tu *yāgena* (conj.: *yogena* draft Ed.) *dravyaiḥ saṃkalpajaiḥ śubhaiḥ | hṛdambujapare turye *cidbhāsārūpam* (corr.: *cidbhāsā rūpam* draft Ed.) *uttamam || 239 kadambagolakākāraṃ*

Nor was the influence of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga confined to the formative period of the Tantric Pañcarātra. For, as I have shown elsewhere, the *Lakṣmītantra* and *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā*, works composed in the South, derive their distinctive doctrinal character from the assimilation of the dynamic non-dualism of the works of the Kashmirian Śākta Śaivas from Utpaladeva (fl. c. A.D. 925–975) to Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050).[84]

ROYAL PATRONAGE OF BUDDHISM

Buddhism enjoyed widespread royal support during this period, notably from the Viṣṇukuṇḍis of Āndhra in the fifth and sixth centuries, from the Maitrakas of Valabhī in Saurāṣṭra in the sixth and seventh, from the Kārkoṭas of Kashmir in the eighth, and throughout our period from the Licchavi and 'Ṭhākurī' kings of Nepal and various dynasties of eastern India, most notably the Pālas (r. c. 750–1200).

The Viṣṇukuṇḍis of Āndhra

Among the eight successive Viṣṇukuṇḍis (r. c. 375–612) known to us from inscriptions three of the last six are known to have been patrons of Buddhism: the third, Govindavarman I (r. c. 422–462), the fifth, Vikramendravarman I (r. c. 502–527), and the seventh, Vikramendravarman II (r. c. 555–572). In the Tummalaguḍem plates (Set I) issued by Mahārāja Govindavarman I he is described as having beautified his kingdom with many temples and Buddhist monasteries, as having given generously to brahmins and Buddhist monks, as having resolved to attain the Great Awakening for the salvation of all living beings, and as having donated two villages—the charter's object is to record this grant—to fund the

---

sūryāyutasamaprabham | ***svānandāspandarūpaṃ** ca saṃcintyātmānam ātmanā* || 240 *parānandasvabhāvastho vetti yaḥ pūjanaṃ vibhoḥ* | *tenārcitenārcitaṃ vai dvisaptabhuvanātmakam* || 241 *viśvaṃ dyāvāpṛthivī ca sadevāsuramānuṣam*; and 274c–275: *tanmadhye viṣṭarasthaṃ ca lakṣmīṃ saṃpūjya pūrvataḥ* || *vinyaset svaśarīrāc ca gurur vai prāṇayogataḥ* | ***ānandaspanda**rūpāṃ*** (corr.: *rūpaṃ* draft Ed.) *cāpy amṛtāmṛtarūpiṇīm*. On *spandaḥ* in Ṣaṭkas 2–4 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 365–366, 406, fn. 579. The term also occurs in the earlier first Ṣaṭka, f. 190v4–5 (45.121–123b): *nistaraṅgārṇavākāraḥ paritṛpta<ḥ> parāparaḥ* | *suśāntamūrtiḥ sarvātmā nirvāṇeśo 'tinirmalaḥ* || 122 *tasya śaktiḥ svakaṃ vīryaṃ ciddhāmānandagocaram* | *vyaktaṃ vyaktivibhedena* ***spandanānandasundaram*** || 123 *taddharmadharmiṇī jñeyā śaktir ādyā śivasya sā*. For evidence that the first Ṣaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala* once formed an independent whole to which Ṣaṭkas 2–4 were added in Kashmir at a later date see SANDERSON 2002, pp. 2 and 22, n. 13, and 2005b, pp. 278–283.

[84] For the evidence see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 35–38. For some other Śaiva features in Pāñcarātrika texts see RASTELLI 2007, pp. 209, 214, and 224–225.

expenses of a Buddhist monastery founded by his chief queen Paramadevī.[85] A second set of plates discovered at Tummalaguḍem contains a charter issued by Vikramendravarman II which records his granting a village for the support of the Buddhist community at this monastery. The founder's husband Govindavarman I is described as having beautified the whole of the Deccan with splendid Stūpas and monasteries, and Vikramendravarman I, his grandson and the grandfather of Vikramendravarman II, is identified as *paramasaugataḥ* 'entirely devoted to the Buddha'.[86] However, in a charter issued by Vikramendravarman II in the previous year, recording a grant of a village to a Śaiva temple, he is referred to as *paramamāheśvaraḥ*, as is his father Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman,[87] drawing to our attention that if a king supported Buddhism he did not necessarily cease to support other faiths or abandon his own.

---

[85] SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:1, ll. 8–24: *anekadevāyatanavihārasabhāprapātaḍākodapānārāmapratisaṃskārāpūrvakaraṇenālaṃkṛtasakaladigantareṇa bhikṣudvijānāthayācakavyādhitadīnakṛpaṇajanopabhujyamānanyāyādhigatavibhavadhanasamudayenāsakṛd asakṛt svasarvasvatyāginā ...sakalasattvadhātutrāṇāyotpāditamahābodhicittena mahārājaśrīgovindavarmaṇā ... svasyā agramahiṣyāḥ paramadevyā vihārasya dīpadhūpagandhapuṣpadhvajapānabhojanaśayanāsanaglānabhaiṣajyakhaṇḍasphuṭitaśīrṇasaṃskārādikuśalamūlānucchedārthaṃ dvāv ermad[ā]llapreṅkapaṟunāmadheyau grāmau udakadānapūrvakam atisṛṣṭau* 'In order that his roots of merit should not be cut off, through [the provision of funds for] such [expenses] as lamps, incense, scents, flowers, banners, drinking water, food, beds, seats, medicines for sick [monks], and repairs to whatever is broken, cracked, and delapidated, the two villages named Ermadāla and Preṅkapaṟu have been donated to the monastery of his chief queen Paramadevī with the [due] pouring of water [into the hand of the recipient] by Mahārāja Govindavarman, who has adorned all parts [of his kingdom] through his unprecedented provision of numerous temples, Buddhist monasteries, meeting halls, fountains, reservoirs, wells, and gardens, all of whose great wealth, lawfully acquired, is being enjoyed by Buddhist monks, brahmins, the unprotected, supplicants, the sick, the wretched, and the poor, who has [in this way] repeatedly given away all his property, and who has generated the intention to attain the Great Awakening for the salvation of all living beings'.

[86] SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:8, ll. 10-18: *paramasaugatasya mahārājaśrīvikramendrasya sūnor ... śrī-indrabhaṭṭārakavarmaṇaḥ priyasūnus ... śrī[mā]n vikramendrabhaṭṭārakavarmā ... ittham avabodhayati* 'Vikramendrabhaṭṭārakavarman, beloved son of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, the son of *paramasaugataḥ* Mahārāja Vikramendra informs you as follows'; ll. 24–33: *atibahuprakāramanoramodārakarmādbhutastūpavihāracūḷāmaṇibhir alaṃkṛtasakaladakṣiṇāpathasya ... śrīgo[vi]ndarājasya mūrtimatīṃ śriyaṃ praty aviṣayīkṛtamanorathayā parama[bha]ṭṭārikāmahādevyā śrīmadindrapuram uccair alaṃkartukāmayeva pratiṣṭhāpite śrīmati paramabhaṭṭārikāmahāvihāre 'smābhi[ḥ] ... cāturdaśāryavarabhikṣusaṃghaparibhogāya ... irundoṟo nāma grāmo dattaḥ* 'I have donated the village called Irundoṟa for the use of the community of excellent monks of the four directions in the venerable Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahāvihāra that was founded by Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahādevī as though desiring to bestow great beauty on Indrapura, fulfilling [thereby] the desire for embodied [royal] splendour of [her husband] King Govinda, who adorned the whole of the Deccan with splendid Stūpas and monasteries that were marvelous in their most various, charming, and noble workmanship'.

The Maitrakas of Valabhī

Of the land-grant documents of the Maitrakas of Valabhī three quarters are records of grants to brahmins, but the remaining quarter report grants made by these kings to Buddhist institutions.[88] Guhasena (r. c. 553–569) has the epithet *paramopāsakaḥ* 'devout lay Buddhist';[89] Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya (r. c. 595–612) is praised for his support of Buddhism in the east-Indian *Rājavyākaraṇa* of the Buddhist Tantric *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*[90] and by the Chinese Huili in his account of the Indian travels of Xuanzang;[91] and the latter, who visited the kingdom of Valabhī in the 630s, when the Maitraka Dhruvasena II was on the throne, reports that the king had recently developed a sincere faith in Buddhism and become a generous donor to the monastic community.[92] Moreover, Valabhī became a major centre of Mahāyana Buddhist scholarship during this period, producing such eminent figures as Sthiramati (*fl. c.* 510–570), for whom a monastery was established in Valabhī during the reign of Guhasena.[93] In their inscriptions, however, Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya, Dhruvasena II, and generally Guhasena too, appear like almost all the other Maitrakas with the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*.[94]

The Kārkoṭas of Kashmir

No inscriptions have survived from the reigns of the kings of the Kārkoṭa dynasty of Kashmir. But from the account of this dynasty given by the Kashmiran historian Kalhaṇa we learn that although, as we have seen, the temples they established with their names were Viṣṇus,[95] they or those closely associated with them also established several Buddhist foundations: the Anantabhavanavihāra founded by the queen of Durlabhavardhana (r. c. 626–662); the Prakāśikāvihāra founded by Prakāśadevī, queen of Candrāpīḍa (r. c. 712–720/1); the Rājavihāra 'The King's Monastery' founded and richly endowed by Lalitāditya (r. c. 725–761/2) with a large Caitya and a huge Buddha image at his new capital Parihāsapura; the Kayyavihāra, founded during the rule of the same by Kayya, a king of Lāṭa; a Vihāra, a Stūpa, and golden Buddha images established at Parihāsapura by Lalitāditya's Central Asian chief minister Caṅkuṇa; a Vihāra and a Caitya established by the same in the capital; and a large monastery and three Buddha images established by Jayāpīḍa (r. c. 773/4–804/5) in his new capital Jayapura.[96]

---

[87] The Chikkula plates of Vikramendravarman (SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:7), ll. 15–19: *parama[mā]heśvarasya mahārājasya śrī-indrabhaṭṭārakavarmaṇa[ḥ] priyajyeṣṭhaputro ...paramamāheśvaro mahārāja[ḥ] śrīmān vikramendravarmā evam ājñāpayati.*

[88] SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, p. 360.

[89] SCHMIEDCHEN 1993, p. 84.

[90] *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 53.537d–540: *samudratīraparyantaṃ lāḍānāṃ janapade tathā* || 38 *śīlāhvo nāma nṛpatiḥ buddhānāṃ śāśane rataḥ* | *purīṃ valabhya samprāpto dharmarājā bhaviṣyati* || 39 *vihārān dhātuvarān citrān *śreyase* (em.: *śreyasāṃ* Ed.) *prāṇināṃs tathā* | *kārayiṣyati yuktātmā bhūpatir dharmavatsalaḥ* || 40 *pūjāṃ ca vividhākārāṃ jinabimbāṃ manoramām* | *pūjayed dhātuvarān agryān lokanāthebhyo yaśasviṣu* | *nāsau mantrasiddhas tu kevalaṃ karmajottamaḥ* 'In the land of the Lāṭas up to the shore of the [western] ocean a king called Śīla, devoted to the teaching of the Buddhas, will become a Dharmarāja in the city of Valabhī. That royal friend of Buddhism, of well-disciplined mind, will build monasteries and beautiful relic Stūpas for the welfare of living beings. [He will establish] the manifold worship of beautiful images of the Buddha; and he will venerate the most excellent of the relics of the renowned Buddhas. He will not achieve success through [the Buddhist Way of] Mantras, but will excell simply through acts of [lay] piety'. For the east-Indian origin of the text see *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 53.627a: *gauḍadeśe 'smin*; and 53.810a: *prācyadeśe 'smin*.

[91] BEAL 1914, p. 148.

[92] *Xiyu ji*, vol. 2, pp. 267–268. For a detailed account and analysis of religious patronage under the Maitrakas during the sixth and seventh centuries see NJAMMASCH 2001, pp. 199–278.

[93] On the dates of Sthiramati and the evidence that a monastery was established for him see FRAUWALLNER 1961, pp. 136 ff.

[94] See, e.g., the Alīṇā copper-plate inscription of Śīlāditya VII of A.D. 766/7, *CII*:39. There all the kings listed are said to be *paramamāheśvaraḥ*: the general Bhaṭārka, the founder of the dynasty, followed, after an unspecified number of generations, by Guhasena, Dharasena (II), Śīlāditya (I), Kharagraha (I), Dharasena (III), Dhruvasena (II), Dharasena (IV), Dhruvasena (III), Kharagraha (II), Śīlāditya (II), Śīlāditya (III), Śīlāditya (IV), Śīlāditya (V), and Śīlāditya (VI). In the Māliyā copper-plate inscription of Dharasena II, A.D. 571/2, we are given the names of the Maitrakas who ruled between the founder Bhaṭārka and Dharasena II. They are Dharasena I, Droṇasiṃha, Dhruvasena I, and Dharapaṭṭa. Of these the first two have the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*; Dhruvasena is here a Vaiṣṇava (*paramabhāgavataḥ*) rather than a Buddhist (*paramopāsakaḥ*); and Dharapaṭṭa is a devotee of the Sun-God (*paramādityabhaktaḥ*. It seems that in the later years of the Maitraka dynasty, when Śaivism had become firmly established as the religion of this dynasty, there was a desire to forget those early rulers, Dhruvasena and Dharapaṭṭa, whose religious preference had deviated. This practice of beginning the account of lineage with Bhaṭārka and then jumping to Guhasena and his successors, so that all the kings have the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*, is already seen in the Dana plates of Dhruvasena II issued in 634/5 (*EI* 42:15).

[95] See here, p. 60.

[96] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 4.3 (Anaṅgabhavana); 4.79 (Prakāśikāvihāra); 4.200–205 (Rājavihāra etc.); 4. 210 (Kayyavihāra); 4.211 and 215 (the foundations of Caṅkuṇa); and 4.507 (the foundations of Jayāpīḍa). For the vestiges of Lalitāditya's Rājavihāra, his Caitya, and Caṅkuṇa's Stūpa at Parihāsapura (Paraspor) see Krishna DEVA in *EITA* vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 366–367; plates 722–727. Caṅkuṇa is evidently a rendering of the Chinese military title *jiangjun* 'General' rather than a name.

The Licchavis of Nepal

In the Kathmandu valley the inscriptions of kings throughout our period show their devotion to Śiva. But here too, where Buddhism and Śaivism co-existed among the Newars down to the present, there is ample evidence of royal support for the former. The Licchavi Vṛṣadeva is described in an inscription of his eighth-century descendant Jayadeva as having inclined towards Buddhism;[97] a view confirmed by a local chronicle, which attributes to him the establishing of Buddhist images;[98] and in the first half of the seventh century Xuanzang claims that the king of Nepal was a sincere believer.[99] The *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, the earliest of the local chronicles, compiled during the reign of Jayasthitimalla (1382–1395), [100] claims that the Caitya at Guṃvihāra and a monastery, the Mānavihāra, were established by Mānadeva, the Caitya of the Sīnagu-vihāra (the Svayambhūnāth Caitya) by Vṛṣadeva,[101] the Dharmadevacaitya (the Cābahīl Caitya) by Dharmadeva, a monastery and the Khasaucaitya (the Bodhnāth Caitya)[102] by Śivadeva, the Phuṭovihāra and a Caitya by Campādeva, the Rājavihāra by Aṃśuvarman, the Devalavihāra by Devaladeva, and a monastery at Nandiśālā by Śivadeva. To Narendradeva and his Buddhist preceptor Bandhudatta it attributes the instituting of the annual chariot festival (*yātrā*) of the popular Newar Buddhist deity Bugmalokeśvara

---

[97] *LKA* 148, l. 9: *sugataśāsanapakṣapātī.*

[98] LÉVI 1990, vol. 2, p. 98.

[99] *Xiyu ji*, vol. 2, p. 81.

[100] The *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, preserved in a single, palm-leaf manuscript that has lost the first sixteen of its folios, consists of three originally separate parts. The first (ff. 17r–30v) covers the period down to 1386. Its coverage of the period before the reign of Anantamalla (1274–1307) (ff. 17r–26r) consists of little more than a list of kings, the lengths of their reigns, in some cases a record of their religious foundations and a few contemporary events such as plagues and famines and rituals undertaken to avert them. From f. 26v to f. 29r it is a little more forthcoming. The last event it records is dated in 1379. Up to this point the text is in a low register of Sanskrit. The remainder of the first part, f. 29v–30v, is written in Old Newari in a more annalistic style and extends the account down to 1386. The second text (ff. 30v–36r), in Old Newari mixed with Sanskrit, covers the years 1056/7 to 1275/6. It consists for the most part of chronological genealogy, giving dates of birth, length of reign, and age at death. The third (ff. 36v–63v + another f. 50), in Old Newari, is an annalistic chronicle whose main concern is to record religious foundations, with entries extending from 1258/9 to 1388/9. See PETECH 1984, p. 6.

[101] The manuscript gives the name Viśvadeva here, but as the editors propose, this is surely an error for Vṛṣadeva (f. 20r2–3): *rājā śrīviśvadeva varṣa 100 tena kṛta sīnaguvihāra caityabhaṭṭārike pratiṣṭhita saṃpūrṇa kṛtam.* The identification of this with the famous Svayambhūnāth Caitya is evident from the name Sīnagu, which corresponds to Syaṅgu, its modern Newari name.

[102] This identification follows from the fact that the Bodhnath Stūpa is known as Khasa Caitya in Newari. On these early Nepalese Caityas—this term rather than Stūpa is the normal usage in Nepal—see GUTSCHOW 1997, pp. 85–99.

(Būgadyaḥ/Karuṇāmaya-Matsyendranāth).[103] Unsurprisingly, the Amarāvatīmahāvihāra (Būga Bāhāḥ) at Bungamati, the home of Bugmalokeśvara, claims to have been founded by him.[104]

Mānadeva's dated inscriptions range in date from 459 to 505/6,[105] and we know from his Cāṅgunārāyaṇa inscription that Vṛṣadeva was his great-grandfather and Dharmadeva his father.[106] The claim that he founded a monastery with his own name, the Mānavihāra, is confirmed by its mention in an undated inscription assigned to his reign.[107] The epigraphical dates of Śivadeva range from 590/1 to 604/5.[108] There is another Licchavi with the same name, with inscriptions ranging from 694 to 705,[109] but it is unlikely that it is the second that is intended, since grants of villages to the Śivadevavihāra have been mentioned in two inscriptions dated in 679, during the reign of his predecessor.[110] The inscriptions of Aṃśuvarman range from 593 to 615;[111] and the Rājavihāra arributed to him by the chronicle is mentioned in one of these, dated in 608. It also mentions the Mānavihāra and the Guṃvihāra, showing the accuracy of the report of the chronicle that these three monasteries are ancient Licchavi foundations. Moreover, it does so in a context that enables us to gauge their relative importance. For it fixes cash allowances from the court (*rājakulam*) to a large number of religious foundations and these are ranked into two groups. The upper comprises the temple of Bhagavat Paśupati, the national Śiva, to whom all Nepalese kings from the time of Aṃśuvarman onwards have declared their allegiance,[112] Dolāśikharasvāmin (Cāṅgunārāyaṇa), the principal Viṣṇu of Nepal, then these three Buddhist monasteries, and two others not mentioned by the chronicle, the Kharjūrikāvihāra and the Madhyamavihāra. All of these are to receive the same allowance; and this is twice that to be received by the institutions listed in the lower group. That comprises "the ordinary monasteries" and the temples of various other deities, most of whom are Śivas, including Māneśvara, evidently the temple of a Liṅga installed by Mānadeva with his name.[113] Narendra, whom the chronicle reports to have instituted the annual chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara, has dated inscriptions from 643 to 679.[114] The last two, issued in 679 and mentioned above for their reference to the Śivadevavihāra, record the granting of villages to that monastery; and the Chinese envoy Wang Xuan-ce reported that when he had an audience with

---

[103] *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* f. 20v5: Caitya at Guṃvihāra; f. 21r1: Mānavihāra; f. 20v2–3: Caitya at Svayambhū; f. 21r3: Dharmadevacaitya; f. 21v1: Khasaucaitya; f. 21v2: Phuṭovihāra and Caitya; f. 22v1: Aṃśuvarman's Rājavihāra; f. 22v3: Devalavihāra; f. 22v5: Śivadeva's monastery; and ff. 22v5–23r1 (the festival of Būgadyaḥ): *śrī narendradeva varṣa 35 tasya ācāryabaṃdhudattadvayena śrībugmalokeśvarabhaṭārakasya jātrā kṛtā bhavati* 'Narendradeva: [reigned for] 35 years. Jointly with his Ācārya Bandhudatta he established the festival of Lord Bugmalokeśvara'. On the festival of Būgadyaḥ, also known (in Nepali) as Rāto ('Red') Matsyendranāth, which is still a major event in the Kathmandu valley, see LOCKE 1980, pp. 244–280.

[104] See the tabulated list of the eighteen principal monasteries of Patan and their founders in LOCKE 1980, pp. 32–33. He includes the Būga Bāhāḥ at its end, noting that it stands apart, not being counted among the principal monasteries of either Patan or Kathmandu.

[105] In the Licchavi inscriptions of *LKA* the earliest date is 464/5 (no. 2) and the latest 505/6 (no. 19). An earlier inscription, dated in Vaiśākha 381 (=A.D. 459), which came to light during renovation work at the Paśupati temple, has been published (ḌHAKĀL 1990). The earliest Licchavi dates are in the Śaka era, which was used until the time of Aṃśuvarman, the last recorded Śaka date being 526 (A.D. 604/5) in *LKA* 69 and 70. Thereafter the inscriptions are dated in a new era, often called Aṃśuvarman's, which commenced in A.D. 576, and continued in use until the introduction of a new era in Kārtika 879, which has remained in use down to modern times.

[106] *LKA* 2, side 1, l. 8–side 2, l. 3: *rājābhūd vṛṣadevaḥ ...yasyābhūt tanayaḥ ...rājā śaṅkaradeva ity anupa[mo] ...devī rājyavatī tu tasya nṛpater bhāryā ...yasyāṃ jāta ... śrīmānadevo nṛpaḥ.*

[107] *LKA* 18, l. 18: *kṣetraṃ cākṣayaṃ dattaṃ [śrī]mānavihāre.*

[108] *LKA* 54 and 70.

[109] *LKA* 138 and 143.

[110] *LKA* 133, ll. 4–11 and 134, ll. 4–12: *ayaṃ grāmo ...śrīśivadevavihā[re] caturdiśāryabhikṣusaṅghāyāsmābhir atisṛṣṭaḥ* 'I have given this village to the congregation of noble monks of the four directions at the Śivadevavihāra'.

[111] *LKA* 59 and 85.

---

[112] See SANDERSON 2005a, p. 417, fn. 254.

[113] *LKA* 77, ll. 6–15: *bhagavataḥ paśupateḥ pu 6 pa 2 dolāśikharasvāminaḥ pu 6 pa 2 +++ guṃvihārasya 6 pa 2 śrīmānavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 śrīrājavihārasya 6 pa 2 kharjūrikāvihārasya 6 pa 2 ma[dhya]mavihārasya 6 pa 2 sāmānyavihārāṇām pu 3 pa 1 rāmeśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 haṃsagṛheśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 māneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 sāmbapurasya pu 3 pa 1 vāgmatīpāradevasya pu 3 pa 1 dhārāmāneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 parvateśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 narasiṃhadevasya pu 3 pa 1 kailāseśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 bhumbhukkikājalaśayanasya pu 3 pa 1 tadanyadevakulānāṃ pu 2 pa 2 …* 'six Pu[rāṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇas] each for Bhagavat Paśupati, Dolāśikharasvāmin (=Cāṅgunārāyaṇa), the Guṃvihāra, the Mānavihāra, the Rājavihāra, the Kharjūrikāvihāra, and the Madhyamavihāra; 3 Pu[rāṇas] and 1 Pa[ṇ]a each for the ordinary Vihāras, and [the temples of Śiva] Rāmeśvara, the Lord of the Haṃsagṛha (=Viṣṇu Lokapālasvāmin), [Śiva] Māneśvara, Sāmba[śiva], Vāgmatīpāradeva [Śiva], [Śiva] Dhārāmāneśvara, [Śiva] Parvateśvara, Narasiṃhadeva, [Śiva] Kailāseśvara, and the [Viṣṇu] Jalaśayana of Bhumbhukkikā (=the Viṣṇu of Budhanīlkaṇṭh); 2 Pu[rāṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇas] for the temples other than these …'. The Kharjūrikāvihāra calls to mind the Stūpa which the Buddha predicts in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* will be built by the Kuṣāṇa emperor Kaniṣka at Kharjūrikā four hundred years after his Parinirvāṇa (*Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 1, l. 20–2, l. 5: *bhagavān kharjūrikām anuprāptaḥ | …eṣa caturvarṣaśataparinirvṛtasya mama vajrapāṇe kaniṣko nāma rājā bhaviṣyati | so 'smin pradeśe stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayati | tasya kaniṣkastūpa iti saṃjñā bhaviṣyati.*

[114] *LKA* 123–134.

Narendradeva in 643 the king's belt was adorned with a Buddha.[115] But here too we see that the support of Buddhism in Nepal as elsewhere was not a sign that a king had changed his religious allegiance in any radical sense. For in both of those inscriptions Narendradeva has the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*.[116]

The Ṭhākurī Kings of Nepal

Between the Licchavis, who last appear in the epigraphical record in 737, and the Malla kings, who ruled from 1200–1768, lies the relatively obscure period of the so-called Ṭhākurī kings. These too, though predominantly Śaiva, supported Buddhist institutions. Only one, Siṃhadeva (r. 1110–1126), has been declared *paramasaugataḥ*;[117] but several of the monasteries of the Kathmandu valley are attributed to kings of this period in inscriptions, palm-leaf deeds, manuscript colophons, or their own tradition: the Padmacakramahāvihāra to Guṇakāmadeva I,[118] the Jyotirmahāvihāra (Jyo Bāhāḥ) and Dattamahāvihāra

---

[115] The report of this encounter has been incorporated in chapter 221 of the *Jiu Tangshu* (Old History of the Tang Dynasty), covering the years 618–906 and compiled in 940–945. In a translation of this passage published by Sylvain LÉVI (1894, p. 67) we read "Leur roi *Na-ling ti-po* (Narendra Deva) … a … des breloques à sa ceinture, ornées d'un *Fou-tou* (Buddha?)". In a footnote he explains the question mark, saying that the use of *fou-tou* for 'Buddha' in the seventh century is problematic. But when he re-published his translation (1905a, vol. 1, p. 164) he removed the question mark.

[116] *LKA* 133, ll. 1–3: *bhagavatpaśupatibhaṭṭārakapādānugṛhīto bappapādānudhyāto licchavikulaketuḥ paramamāheśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaśrīnarendradevaḥ kuśalī gullaṅgaṅgrāmanivāsinaḥ pradhānapuraḥsarān sarvakuṭumbinaḥ samājñāpayati* 'Favoured by the venerable lord Paśupati, devoted to his venerable father, the banner of the Licchavi dynasty, entirely devoted to Śiva, the supreme Lord, the paramount king Narendradeva greets the elders and all the other householders who live in Gullaṅgaṅ village and commands them [as follows]'. The same formula is seen in 134, ll. 1–4. Only the name of the village differs.

The historicity of Campādeva and Devaladeva, the remaining two kings mentioned by the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* as the founders of monasteries, is doubtful. They appear nowhere in the corpus of known Licchavi inscriptions, and in the local chronicles only in the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, which places the first between Śivadeva and Narendradeva and the second before Dhruvavarman—another name found only in this source—and Bhīmārjunadeva.

[117] Colophon of ASB MS 9973 (SHĀSTRI 1917, pp. 4–5): *paramasaugataśrīmatsiṃhadevasya vijayarājye.*

[118] PETECH (1984, p. 40) quotes the following colophon of an *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* MS (NAK 3-359) that he wrongly reports as *Catuṣpīṭhanibandha*: *samvat 100 60 5 śrāvaṇaśukladaśamyāṃ śukradine | rājye śrībhāskaradevasya | śrīguṇakāmadevakārite śrīpadmacakramahāvihāre sthitaśākyabhikṣukumāracandreṇa likhitam* 'Copied by Śākyabhikṣu Kumāracandra, resident of the Padmacakramahāvihāra founded by Guṇakāmadeva, on Friday, the bright tenth of Śrāvaṇa, in the year 165 during the reign of Bhāskaradeva'. The date of copying is 26 July 1045 (PETECH, *loc. cit.*).

(Dau Bāhāḥ) to Rudradeva I (c. 1007–1018) or Rudradeva II (1167–1175), the Hiraṇyavarṇamahāvihāra (Kwā Bāhāḥ) and the Pārāvatamahāvihāra (Itūm Bāhāḥ) to Bhāskaradeva (1039–1048), the Mayūravarṇamahāvihāra (Bhĩchē Bāhāḥ) to Śaṅkaradeva (1069–1082), the Tedovihāra (Te Bāhāḥ) to Śivadeva (1098–1126), the Jayamanoharavarṇamahāvihāra (Su Bāhāḥ) and Āsanalokeśvaramahāvihāra, also called Kacchapālagirimahāvihāra (Co Bāhāḥ) to Indradeva (1126–1136), the Cakravarṇamahāvihāra (Cūka Bāhāḥ) to Mānadeva (1136–1140), the Rudravarṇamahāvihāra / Uṅkulīmahāvihāra (Uku/U Bāhāḥ), the Maṇipurajaivamahāvihāra, and and the Bandhudattamahāvihāra to Narendradeva (1140–1147), and the Śrīvatsavihāra (Atha Bāhāḥ) to Ānandadeva (1147–1167).[119] However, it is possible in the cases of Śaṅkaradeva, Śivadeva, Mānadeva, and Narendradeva, that the attribution intended was to their Licchavi namesakes.

We have very little evidence for the reigns of these Ṭhākurīs, but what there is suffices to remove any suspicion that they were Buddhists to the exclusion of Śaivism. According to the local chronicles Guṇakāmadeva made lavish donations to the temple of Paśupati,[120] Śaṅkaradeva established a temple of a Śiva with his name (Śaṅkareśvara),[121] and Śivadeva gilded the roof of the temple of Paśupati, replaced the god's silver lotus, and donated a golden image of Śiva.[122] Both Indradeva and Ānandadeva have the epithet *paramaśaiva-* attached to their names in the colophons of manuscripts copied during their reigns;[123] and an inscription of 1143/4 records that Ānandadeva, while he was the heir apparent (Yuvarāja), received Śaiva initiation from the Saiddhāntika Guru Rudraśiva of Benares, together with the princes Vasantadeva, Someśvara, Yaśomalla, and Arjunadeva:[124]

---

[119] For these monasteries and the names of the kings by whom they are said to have been founded (*saṃskārita-*, *kārita-*) see LOCKE 1980, pp. 32–33, and 1985, pp. 29, 42, 74, 79, 82, 91, 95, 133, 140, 148. The dates of the reigns of these kings are as determined by PETECH 1984.

[120] Kaiser library *Vaṃśāvalī* fragment (PETECH 1984, Appendix), p. 2: *rājā śrīguṇakāmadeva varṣa 85 māsa 6 || tena śrīpaśupatibhaṭṭārakāya ekādaśakoṣaṃ pradattaṃ tatraiva īśāneśvarabhaṭṭārakāya vāsukibhaṭṭārakasya tāṃmraśaṃṣalīcchādanaṃ kṛtya tatraiva *dīrgha*copārhikā* (conj. : *copātrikā* Ed.) *kṛtya tatraiva suvarṇapanālī koṭihomaṃ kṛtaś ceti || rājā śrī udayadeva varṣa 6 || rājā śrīnirbhayadeva varṣa 5* 'King Guṇakāmadeva: 85 years and 6 months. He donated eleven [metal Liṅga] sheaths to Lord Paśupati. At the same place he covered [the roofs of the shrines] of Lord Īśāneśvara and [the Nāga] Lord Vāsuki with copper *sheets (?), built a long rest-house and a golden water conduit, and performed a fire-sacrifice with ten million oblations'. King Udayadeva: 6 years; King Nirbhayadeva 5 years || …'; cf. *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* f. 23v1–2: *rājā śrīguṇakāmadeva varṣa 85 mā 6 tena śrīpaśupatibhaṭārakāya ekādaśa koṣa saṃpradattā | tatraiva-m īśānyeśvarabhaṭārakāya tāmrasaṃkhalāsaṃchādanaṃ kṛtā | tatraiva dīrghacopā<r>hī kṛtāḥ tatraiva suvarṇapanālī [kṛ]tāḥ koṭihoma pūrṇā kṛtam*. The word *śaṃṣalī* (=*śaṃkhalī* or *saṃkhalā*) is evidently for Skt. *śṛṅkhalā*, *śṛṅkhalikā* 'chain'. I have conjectured the meaning 'sheet' considering the design of the Paśupati temple, whose roof is covered with interlocking metalic plates. *panālī* = *praṇālikā*. With **copārhī* (conj.) cf. Classical Newari *capārha* (Modern Newari *capāḥ*) 'rest-house' (TAMOT *et. al.* 2000, s.v.).

[121] Kaiser library *Vaṃśāvalī* fragment (PETECH 1984, Appendix), p. 4: *rājā śrīśaṅkaradeva varṣa 17 | tena hi nandiśālāyāṃ śaṃk<ar>reśvarabhaṭṭā[rakā]ya pratiṣṭhitā devakulaṃ ca pūrṇaṃ kṛtya rāṣṭraśāntikā + + + + vihāraś ca prāra<bha>ta* 'King Śaṅkaradeva: 17 years. He established [a Liṅga] for Lord Śaṅkareśvara and completed a temple [for him]. He also undertook the construction of the … monastery in order to avert danger from the kingdom' (I conjecture *rāṣṭraśāntikāraṇāt* for *rāṣṭraśāntikā + +*); cf. *Gopālavaṃśāvalī* f. 24r1–2: *rājā śrī śankaradeva varṣa 15 tena ca naṃdīśālāyāṃ saṅkareśvarabhaṭāraka pratiṣṭhitam tāmrasaṃchanna kṛtam devalam || puna bhagavatī manahara bhaṭārikā pratiṣṭhitā || rāṣṭrasānti bhavatiḥ* 'King Śaṅkaradeva: 15 years. He established [a Liṅga of] Śaṅkareśvarabhaṭṭāraka at Nandiśālā and covered the temple with a copper roof. He also established Bhagavatī Manahara. This brought about the averting of danger from the kingdom'.

[122] Kaiser library *Vaṃśāvalī* fragment (PETECH 1984, Appendix III), pp. 4–5: *rājā śrīśi[vadeva va]rṣa 27 māsa 7 | tena hi paśupatibhaṭṭārakasya suvarṇaśṛṃ[khalī]chādanaṃ kṛta …śrīmatpaśupatibhaṭṭārakasya rajatapadma punar ghaṭita* 'King Śivadeva: 27 years and 7 months. He covered [the temple of] Paśupatibhaṭṭāraka with gilded metal plates and remade his silver lotus'; cf. *Gopālavaṃśāvalī* f. 24r3–v1.

[123] PETECH 1984, p. 57, colophon of a manuscript of the *Cāndravyākaraṇavṛtti* in Tibet: *śrīmadrājādhirājaparameśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakaparamaśaiva-indradevasya śrī-indradevasya vijayarājye*; and PETECH 1984, p. 61, colophon of an *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript: + + + *paramabhaṭṭārakaparamaśaivamahārājādhirājaśrīmadānandadevapravarddhamānakalyāṇavijayarājye*. The scribal date of completion falls in 1134 in the first case and in 1166 in the second.

[124] Vv. 23–25: *asyāṃ śrīraghuvaṃśamauktika*maṇir jāto janānandanaḥ* (ACHARYA: *maṇi …dataḥ* REGMI) *sāndraś candra ivānvito 'timadhurair ānandadevaḥ karaiḥ | uccaiḥ śaktidharaḥ kumārapadavīṃ *prāpto 'pi tair* (ACHARYA: *prāptocitair* REGMI) **dīkṣito [dāntaḥ siddhim avarṇa]nīyamahimā* (ACHARYA: *dīkṣita …ya mahimā* REGMI) **prāpat parām aiśvarīm* (ACHARYA: *prāpa …tyaiśvarīṃ* REGMI) || 24 **śaurye 'rjunasamaḥ* (ACHARYA: *saurye 'yaṃ na sama* REGMI) **prekṣya guṇāṃs teṣu guṇapriyaḥ* (ACHARYA : *prekṣaguṇās te praguṇapriyaḥ* REGMI) | *bhaktim *arjunadevo 'pi vidadhe vibudheṣv iva* (ACHARYA: *bhaktim arjunaṃ datvā …vaḥ*) REGMI) 25 *vasantadevo vijñānī *dhīmān* (ACHARYA: *śrīmān* REGMI) *someśvaras tathā | yaśomalla*ś ca* (ACHARYA: *śva* REGMI) *tair eva kumārā dīkṣitā amī*. The plural pronouns here, ***tair dīkṣito*** in 23c, ***guṇāṃs teṣu*** in 24b, and ***tair eva*** in 25d, are plurals of respect (*ādare bahuvacanam*) and refer to Rudraśiva, who is also referred to in the plural in v. 12: *śiṣyā babhūvur iha rudraśivā iti*, as is his Guru Mūrtiśiva in v. 8: *bhaṭṭārakā uditamūrtiśivābhidhānāḥ*. This record that contains these verses, a stone inscription now in the Government Museum in Kathmandu, has been published by REGMI (1965–1966, pt. 3, pp. 13–16) and, in a more complete and accurate form, by ACHARYA (1997) with an annotated Nepali translation. It was subsequently published by TAṆḌAN (1999, part 2, pp. 114–123), adopting only some of ACHARYA's improvements. ACHARYA understands the number 64 in the damaged penultimate line (…*[ca]tuḥṣaṣṭi …yāta sa* …) to be the last two digits of the inscription's date. The full number he conjectures to have been 264, which corresponds to A.D. 1143/4. He is surely right, since this is the only +64 date that fits the persons mentioned. Moreover, falling four years before Ānandadeva became king the date accords with the information that he was still

> In this [city] was born Ānandadeva, a jewel in the pearl-necklace of the lineage of Raghu, delighting the people like a gentle moon with its most charming rays. Being self-controlled and of indescribable greatness, though he had achieved the status of prince (*kumāra-*) of great power (/though he had achieved the status [only] of Kumāra who brandishes the javelin), he achieved when initiated by [Rudraśiva] the ultimate attainment of Śiva[hood]. Likewise Arjunadeva, Arjuna's equal in martial valour and a lover of virtues, conceived as great a devotion to this [Rudraśiva] as to the gods, when he had seen his virtues. As for the learned Vasantadeva, the wise Someśvara, and Yaśomalla, those princes too were initiated by the same [Guru].

Neither Arjunadeva nor Yaśomalla are otherwise known from this ill-documented phase of Nepalese history. But we do have records of both a Vasantadeva, who was born in 1112 and died in 1163 but did not rule, and of a Someśvaradeva, who was born in 1119, died in 1182, and ruled from 1178 to 1183/5.[125]

The Bhauma-Karas of Orissa

But it was in the region of the modern territories of Bihar, West Bengal, Bangladesh, and Orissa that Buddhism enjoyed its most spectacular success in these centuries. It is only there that we find dynasties whose commitment to Buddhism was such that it was commonly signalled in their inscriptions through the use of such epithets as *paramasaugataḥ* and *paramatāthāgataḥ* 'entirely devoted to the Buddha'. Notable among these are the early Bhauma-Karas of Orissa (r. c. 825–950),[126] the early Candras of southeast Bengal (r. c. 850–1050), and, above all, the Pāla emperors of Gauḍa (r. c. 750–1199), who at the height of their power extended their authority throughout eastern India and beyond.[127]

---

the Yuvarāja at the time of his initiation.

[125] See PETECH 1984, pp. 64–67 and 71–72, and the Genealogical Table A, p. 229.

[126] The name Bhauma-Kara is Indological. The early inscriptions speak of these rulers as Bhaumas and the later as Karas, evidently after the -kara that ends most of their names.

[127] The Pālas and their successors, the Senas, are regularly described as kings of Gauḍa (*gauḍeśvaraḥ*, *gauḍendraḥ*, *gauḍarājaḥ*, *gauḍādhipaḥ*, *gauḍapatiḥ*, etc.); see, e.g., SIRCAR 1983a:26, l. 33 (Lakṣmaṇasena); here pp. 108 (Nayapāla) and 109 (Palapāla, Mahīpāla); *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* 1449, 1496. The name Gauḍa in its narrow sense refers to a territory covering parts of West Bengal, being distinguished from Magadha, Vaṅga, and Aṅga. But with expansion of the power of its rulers it came to denote a much larger territory. Thus Campā in modern Bihar, the capital of ancient Aṅga, is described as the capital of Gauḍa in the *Anargharāghava* (Act 7, prose before v. 124: *campā nāma gauḍānāṃ ... rājadhānī*), and Kauśāmbī, about 35 miles south-west of Allahabad, is said to be in it in the *Hitopadeśa* (*Mitralābha*, *Kathā* 5, p. 19: *asti gauḍaviṣaye kauśāmbī nāma nagarī*).

Of the early Bhauma-Kara kings of Orissa Kṣemaṅkara, who probably reigned around the beginning of the ninth century, is described in inscriptions as a *paramopāsakaḥ* 'a dedicated lay Buddhist', his son and successor Śivakara I as *paramatāthāgataḥ*, his son and successor Śubhākara I, as *paramasaugataḥ* and *paramopāsakaḥ*, his son and successor Śivakara II as *śrīsugatāśrayaḥ* 'having the venerable Buddha as his refuge', and his son Śubhākaradeva II, who reigned after his father's brother Śāntikara I *alias* Gayāḍa, as *paramasaugataḥ*.[128] A copper-plate of Tribhuvanamahādevī, the Vaiṣṇava (*paramavaiṣṇavī*) wife of Śāntikara I, who occupied the throne as queen after the reign of her son Śubhākara III *alias* Kusumahāra, records that Śubhākara (I), her husband's father, built a lofty Buddhist monastery;[129] another issued by her records that the earlier kings of her line had adorned the land with many Maṭhas, Buddhist monasteries, and temples;[130] and a third issued c. 980 by the *paramamāheśvaraḥ* Śivakara III *alias* Lalitahāra, the son of her grandson Śivakara II, records the granting of a village in favour of a temple of the Buddha in Uttaratosalī made through him by his vassal Rāṇaka Vinītatuṅga.[131]

This epigraphical record is meagre, but it is very likely that it was the patronage of these kings that enabled Mahāyāna Buddhism to grow and prosper as it did in Orissa, with the Tantric forms of that religion coming to the fore from the eighth century.[132] This efflorescence is attested by both archaeology and textual evidence. Excavations of the Ratnagirimahāvihāra in the Cuttack district, not far from Guheśvarapāṭaka, the Bhauma-Kara capital at or near the modern Jājpur, have revealed that this foundation underwent phenomenal expansion up to the twelfth century,[133] and this is only the foremost of several Buddhist sites in Orissa in which Tantric Buddhism is evident in the surviving statuary.[134] The extremely high quality of Ratnagiri's stone-work renders it improbable that it was not a royal foundation. We have at least one Tantric text that reports that it was written here: the *Saṃvarodayā nāma Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya, which survives in a Nepalese manuscript copied in 1050 in the Mānadevamahāvihāra (Chuka Bāhāḥ);[135] and a manuscript of the *Vimalaprabhā*, the great commentary on the *Kālacakratantra*, penned in the early decades of the twelfth century, in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of Harivarman, has a postscript in another hand added seven years later which locates the manuscript not far from Ratnagiri near the Benga river.[136] Indeed Ratnagiri had a particularly close association with the propagation of that Tantra according to the Tibetan account of the history of the transmission of its teachings maintained in the lineage that descends from Rva chos rab in the early twelfth century. For that relates that the *Vimalaprabhā* was transmitted by an emanation of Mañjuśrī to Paṇḍita Cilu, a native of Orissa trained at the Ratnagiri monastery, and reached Rva chos rab after being passed on through five intermediaries in Bengal and Bihar.[137] A tradition that Cilu studied the *Kālacakratantra* in the Ratnagirimahāvihāra before seeking the *Vimalaprabhā* is recorded by Gzhon nu dpal.[138]

---

[128] *EI* 15:1 (the Neulpur grant of Śubhākara I), ll. 2–5, and *EI* 28:36 (the Teruṇḍiā plate of Śubhākara II), ll. 4–13. The religious affiliation of Śāntikara I and of five of the subsequent twelve rulers of this dynasty is not recorded. Among the remainder are two Śaiva kings, Śubhākara IV and his brother and successor Śivakara III, two Vaiṣṇava queens (*paramavaiṣṇavī*), namely Tribhuvanamahādevī I, wife of Śāntikara I, and Tribhuvanamahādevī II, wife of Śubhākara IV, and three Śaiva queens (*paramamāheśvarī*), Daṇḍimahādevī, daughter of of Gaurīmahādevī, wife and successor of Śubhākara V, Vakulamahādevī, another wife of Śubhākara V, and Dharmamahādevī, her successor and the wife of Śāntikara III. For the approximate dating of these rulers I follow D.C. SIRCAR's position (1953; *EI* 29:26, pp. 183–184 and 189–191 [note 2]; SALOMON 1998, pp. 190–191) that the Bhauma-Kara era began c. 831. The Neulpur grant of Śubhākara I was issued in year 8 of this era (*EI* 15:1, l. 30), i.e. c. 838, and the Teruṇḍiā plate of Śubhākara II in year 100 (*EI* 28:36, l. 22), i.e. c. 931. The last recorded date is 204 in the reign of Vakulamahādevī, i.e. c. 1035.

[129] *EI* 29:30, Baud plate A of Tribhuvanamahādevī, ll. 5–6: *sutottamas tasya samāśraya[ḥ] śriyaḥ praśāsad ūrvīṃ śuśubhe śubhākaraḥ | kaler alaṅghyaṃ sukṛtāśrayāya yo vihāram uccair vidadhe śilāmayam* 'His superlative son Śubhākara, the resort of good fortune, [next] excelled ruling the land. To embody his merit he built a lofty monastery of stone which the degenerate age could not enter.'

[130] SHASTRI 1916:G, ll. 7–9: *nirantaraviracitavividhamaṭhavihāraprāsādaprabandhaiḥ purandarapurārohaṇasopānabandhair iva maṇḍitamahīmaṇḍaleṣu ākhaṇḍalaprabhaveṣu mahārājeṣu vyatīteṣu* 'After the passing of those Mahārājas, mighty as Indra, who adorned the land with the manifold sequences of Maṭhas, Vihāras, and temples that they constructed without interruption as though with stairways for ascending to the heaven of Indra ...'.

[131] MISRA 1934:I, Talcher plate of Śivakaradeva, ll. 25–29.

The Candras of South-East Bengal

As for the Candras, they used the wheel of the Buddha's teaching (*dharmacakram*) as the seal-symbol on their charters; the Paścimbhāg copper-plate grant of Śrīcandra I (r. c. 925–75) describes both this king and his predecessor Trailokyacandra as *paramasaugataḥ*;[139] and his Rāmpāl and Madanpur copper-plate grants describe Suvarṇacandra, the predecessor of Trailokyacandra (r. c. 900–925), as a *bauddhaḥ* 'a follower of the Buddha's teachings'.[140] After Trailokyacandra came Śrīcandra (II), Kalyāṇacandra, Laḍahacandra, and Govindacandra. The Maināmatī plates of Laḍahacandra and Govindacandra (r. c. 1000–1020 and c. 1020–1045) provide these names and reveal that the last two were *paramasaugataḥ*.[141]

The Khaḍgas of Samataṭa

We have epigraphical evidence of three successive generations of kings of the Khaḍga line ruling the Samataṭa region of southeast Bengal from about 625 into the early years of the eighth century. Though the inscriptions do not include the epithet *paramasaugataḥ* they do speak of these rulers in equivalent terms. The first, Khaḍgodyama, is described in an inscription of his great-grandson Rājarāja as having conquered the earth after declaring his intense devotion to the Three Jewels: the Buddha, his teachings, and the Saṅgha.[142] The same inscription tells us that Rājarāja gave land to these three;[143] and another that Devakhaḍga, the father of Rājarāja, made a donation to the same for the longevity of his son.[144] We have no evidence of any support given to Śaivism by these kings themselves. But a pedestal inscription on an image of the Śaiva Goddess records that it was gilded out of devotion by Prabhāvatī, Devakhaḍga's queen.[145]

---

[132] MITRA 1981, pp. 20–21. Xuanzang reports in the early seventh century that Buddhism was the principal faith of the region, with some 100 monasteries and 10,000 monks, all following the Mahāyāna; *Xiyu ji*, p. 204.

[133] MITRA 1984, p. 225–232. On the phases of construction at Ratnagiri see BROWN 1978. On the successive phases of the Mantranaya manifest in the images that have survived at Ratnagiri and other Orissan sites see LINROTHE 1999, pp. 53–57, 70, 108–111, 125–128, 168–169, 195–198, 251–255, 280–283, and 287–288.

[134] Notable are the nearby sites of the Mādhavapuravihāra at Udayagiri and and the Candrādityavihāra at Lalitagiri. On Udayagiri see BANDYOPADHYAYA 2007; and on Lalitagiri see CHAULEY 2000; and *IAR* 1985–6, pp. 62–63; 1986–87, pp. 64–67; 1987–88, pp. 88–90; 1988–89, pp. 65–66; 1989–90, pp. 77–80; 1990–91, pp. 54–55.

[135] *Saṃvarodayā* f. 56v3–4: *śrīmadratnagirau sthitvā sarvasattvārthahetunā | kṛteyaṃ maṇḍalopāyikā bhūvācā<r>yeṇa dhīmatā | śrīsaṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā *samāptā* (corr. : *samāptaḥ* Cod.) || • || *saṃvat a cū *proṣṭhapadakṛṣṇacaturthyāṃ* (*proṣṭhapada* conj. : *pretipada* Cod.) *rājādhirājapa[ram]eśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakaśrībaladeva + + vijayarāj<y>e likhitam | śrīmānadevamahā*vihārīyaśākyabhikṣusādhuśrīdevasya* (*vihārīya* conj. : *vihāre* Cod.) *pustakam *<| yad atra puṇyaṃ tad bhavatu>* (diagn. conj.) *mātāpitṛgurūpādhyāyasakalasattvarāśe<r> anuttara<jñāna>phala*prāptaya iti* (conj. : *prāpnoti* Cod.).

[136] SHASTRI 1917, pp. 79–80 (ASB MS 10766). The manuscript is dated by the scribe in year 39 of the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Harivarman, on whom see MAJUMDAR 1971, pp. 209–210. Colophon: *mahārājādhirājaśrīmat-harivarmadevapādīyasaṃvat 39 | sūryagatyā āṣāḍhadine 39.* The postscript: *ṣaṭcatvāriṃśatigate vatsare harivarmaṇaḥ | māghasya kṛṣṇasaptamyāṃ ekādaśadine gate || mṛtayā cuñcadukayā gauryā svapnena dṛṣṭayā | kaniṣṭhāṅgulim ādāya *pṛṣṭayedam* (corr. : *pṛṣṭhayedam* SHASTRI) *udīritam | pūrvottare diśobhāge beṃganadyās tathā kule | †paccatvaṃ bhāṣitavataḥ† saptasaṃvatsarair iti.*

[137] OROFINO 1994, pp. 17–23; *Blue Annals*, p. 755.

[138] *Blue Annals*, p. 755.

[139] *EI* 37:51, ll. 25–26.

[140] *EI* 12:18, l. 6; *EI* 28:9, l. 8; and MAJUMDAR 1971, p. 201.

[141] *EI* 38:35, no. 1, ll. 35–36; no. 2, ll. 6–7; no. 3, ll. 33–34. As for Pūrṇacandra (r. c. 850–875), there is no explicit evidence of his religious persuasion. MAJUMDAR (1971, p. 201) argues that since it is said in the Rāmpāl copper-plate that Suvarṇacandra, his son, "became a follower of the Buddha" (*EI* 12:18, ll. 5–7) it is probable that before him the family was non-Buddhist. This is not accurate, since the text says not that he *became* a Buddhist but only that he was one: *buddhasya yaḥ śaśakajātakam aṅkasaṃsthaṃ bhaktyā bibharti || bhagavān amṛtākarāṃśuḥ | candrasya tasya kulajāta itīva bauddha[ḥ] putraḥ śruto jagati tasya suvarṇacandraḥ* 'His son was Suvarṇacandra, famed in the world, a Buddhist as though [simply] because he was born in the lineage of the Moon (/the Candra lineage), which out of devotion to the Buddha displays his incarnation as a hare in its markings'. The allusion here is to the story exemplifying the Buddhist Perfection of Generosity (*dānapāramitā*) that the Buddha gave away his own body as food when he was a hare in a former life, the *śaśajātakam*. The immediately preceding verse, which is devoted to Pūrṇacandra, says nothing substantive about him but only that his name is found as that of the first of the kings of this dynasty in Praśastis and other inscriptions.

The Candras of Arakan and Miscellaneous Other Buddhist Kings of Eastern India

That there were Buddhists among the Candras of Arakan is evident from the Mrohaung pillar inscription of Ānandacandra, which has been dated around the end of the third decade of the eighth century.[146] This gives a list of the names and reign-durations of the kings who preceded him from c. 380 onwards with an interruption of unspecified length. After this interruption come the rulers of the Candra dynasty down to Ānandacandra himself, spanning in this second

---

[142] Ashrafpur plate B (LASKAR 1907), ll. 2–4: *trailokyakhyātakīrtau bhagavati sugate sarvalok[e] + + + taddharme śāntarūpe bhavavibhavabhidāṃ yogināṃ yoga*gamye* (corr. : *gamya* Ed.) | *tatsaṅghe cāprameye vividhaguṇanidhau bhaktim āvedya gurvīṃ śrīmatkhaḍgodyamena kṣitir iyam abhito nirjitā yena* 'Khaḍgodyama, who conquered this earth in all directions after declaring his intense devotion to the Lord Buddha, whose glory has been declared throughout the three worlds, among all men . . . , to his tranquil teachings that can be realized by Yogins who [thereby] break the power of [transmigratory] existence, and to his numberless Saṅgha, the repository of manifold virtues'.

[143] Ashrafpur plate B (LASKAR 1907), ll. 6–7: *tatsuto rājarājaḥ dattaṃ ratnatrayāya tribhavabhaya*bhide* (conj. : *bhidā* Ed.) *yena dānaṃ svabhūmeḥ* 'His [Devakhaḍga's] son, who made a gift of his land to the Three Jewels that eliminate the fear of the three worlds'. To give to the Three Jewels is, I surmise, to make a grant to be divided between the Buddha for the building or maintenance of Buddhist shrines (*gandhakuṭī*) and Stūpas, the Dharma for the copying and teaching of sacred texts, and to the Saṅgha for its sustenance and comfort.

[144] Ashrafpur plate A (LASKAR 1907).

[145] *EI* 17:24,4, ll. 1–2: *tadātmajo dānapatiḥ pratāpī śrīdevakhaḍgo vijitārikhaḍgaḥ* | *rājñas tasya mahādevī mahiṣī śrīprabhāvatī* | *śarvāṇīpratimāṃ bhaktyā hemaliptām akārayat* 'His son was the majestic donor (*dānapatiḥ*) Devakhaḍga, whose sword had defeated his enemies. The chief consort of that king, Mahādevī Prabhāvavatī, had [this] image of Śarvāṇī gilded'. The word *dānapatiḥ* is the standard Buddhist term for one who gives to monks, the Dharma, or the Buddha. The image (HUNTINGTON 1984, fig. 26) was found in the village of Deulbāḍī, near Comilla, together with a Sūrya and small Liṅgas, all of brass.

[146] D.C. SIRCAR in *EI* 32:11, p. 1071–108.

sequence a total of three hundred and fifty years. For most of his ancestors we are given no information other than their names and the lengths of their reigns, but the record is more forthcoming as it approaches the time of Ānandacandra himself. Vajraśakti (r. c. 649–665) is said to have died and gone to the world of the gods endowed with [the Buddhist perfections (*pāramitāḥ*) of] generosity, morality and the rest, and his successor Dharmavijaya (665–701) is said to gone to the same, this time defined as the Buddhist Tuṣita heaven, as a result of his firm commitment to the Three Jewels.[147] Two short inscriptions from Vesālī of the time of his ancestors Nīticandra (r. c. 520–575) and Vīracandra (r. c. 575–578) tell us that the wife of the former, queen Sāvitāṃ-Candraśrī, was a lay Buddhist (*paramopāsikā*) and that the latter established a hundred Stūpas.[148] As for Ānandacandra, he calls himself a lay Buddhist and devotes nine verses to detailing his works of Buddhist piety, which included building many monasteries with his own name, establishing precious images of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and such [Mahāyānist] goddesses as Cundā, having hundreds of Buddhist scriptures copied, and giving to many monks from various lands, which is to say, that he fulfilled to the best of his ability his duty to honour each of the Three Jewels.[149]

Yet even this devoted patron of his faith did not neglect to extend his support to the followers of other religions in his realm. He tells us that although he is a Buddhist he desires the good of all beings, lest his cultivation of the Buddhist Perfection of Generosity (*dānapāramitā*) be incomplete, and so has established four Maṭhas for the housing of fifty brahmins, providing them with land and workers, and two others, the Ānandeśvaramaṭha and the Ānandamādhavamaṭha, whose names reveal that they were associated with a Śiva and a Viṣṇu established with his name.[150] Moreover, a fragmentary copper-plate inscription (*EI* 37:13) from a site near Mrohaung recording a donation by queen Kimmājuvdevī of a village to a Buddhist monastery founded by herself begins by relating six generations of the ascendants of her husband the king. Unfortunately the names of this king and his ancestors have been lost through the scissoring off of strips from the top and right hand side of the plate. However, what remains conveys the unexpected information that all these kings were *paramamāheśvaraḥ*. The editor of the inscription assigns it to the sixth century on the grounds of its close palaeographic similarity to the grants of Nīticandra and Vīracandra, and argues that if the first of the six kings was, as is likely, Dveṅcandra, the founder of the Candra dynasty, then the king in question was Nīticandra's father Bhūticandra (r. c. 496–520).[151] Vīracandra, he argues, is excluded by the fact that one of the two Vesālī inscriptions records his patronage of Buddhism. However, that a king should give to Buddhism and at the same time be declared a *paramamāheśvaraḥ* in documents issued by the royal chancellery is quite within the bounds of possibility, as we have seen.

---

[147] Inscription of the western face of the pillar at the Shittaung Pagoda, Mrohaung, Arakan (JOHNSTON 1944:A), vv. 37c–40: *vajraśaktis tata<ḥ> [kh]yāto rājā devānvayodbhavaḥ* ‖ *pratipālya jagat sarvaṃ rājyaṃ ṣoḍaśavatsaram* | ***dānaśīlādisaṃyukto devalokaṃ sa yātavān*** ‖ *śrīdharmajayasaṃyukto lokānugrahatatparaḥ* | *tatpaścād abhavad dhīraḥ śrīdharmavijayo nṛpaḥ* ‖ *ṣaṭtriṃśad abdāny upabhujya rājyaṃ dharmeṇa nītyā ca jayena caiva* | ***ratnatrayānusmaraṇābhiyogāt sa devalokaṃ tuṣitaṃ prayātaḥ.***

[148] *EI* 32:11, no. 1, ll. 3–4: *devisāvitāṃ-candraśrīyā nāma paremopāsikasya*; *EI* 32:11, no. 2, ll. 1, 3–4: *satyadharmmānarāgena kṛtaṃ svārtheṇa bhūbhujā . . . śrīvīracandradeveṇa mahīmaṇḍalamaṇḍanaṃ* | *dharmmādhigatarājyeṇa buddhastūpaśataṃ kṛtaṃ.*

[149] JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv. 46–54.

[150] JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv. 55–56: *pañcāśadbrāhmaṇāvāsaṃ kṣetrabhṛtyasamanvitam* | *vādyavādakasaṃyuktaṃ kāritaṃ maṭhacatuṣṭayam* ‖ *somatīrthadvijāvāse maṭhaś cānandamādhavaḥ* | *ānandeśvaranāmāpi naulakk[e] ca maṭha<ḥ> smṛtaḥ.* The practice of establishing a Viṣṇu with the founder's name followed by -mādhava (as an alternative to the standard -svāmin) is in accordance with textual prescription; see Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1998, p. 311 (v. 48), =*Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*,

Other royals of eastern India who are identified as *paramasaugataḥ* in our period—apart from the imperial Pālas, to whom I shall turn presently—are Bhavadeva of Devaparvata in Samataṭa (r. c. 765–780), the founder of the Buddhist monastery Bhavadevamahāvihāra at Paṭṭikera, modern Maināmatī, Rājyapāla of the Kāmboja dynasty of Priyaṅgupura in the tenth, Madhusena, the Sena king of Gauḍa, in the thirteenth, and, in Orissa, Udayavarāha of the Mayūravaṃśa at some time in the tenth to twelfth, the Nandodbhava Dhruvānanda of Jayapura, the successor of the *paramamāheśvaraḥ* Devānanda II, in the late tenth, and Kāntideva of Harikela in the ninth.[152] The inscription that tells us that the last was *paramasaugataḥ* also conveys that Buddhism was the faith of his grandfather Bhadradatta. After a benedictory verse in praise of the Buddha it begins the eulogy of the donor's forebears with this king, saying that his devotion to the Buddha had intensified his power and that he had [thereby] conquered all his enemies. His son Dhanadatta, the donor's father, is

---

ff. 72v7–73r1: *svāmyantaṃ mādhavāntaṃ vā kartṛnāmnā ca saṃyutam | dhārayen nāma devasya viṣṇoḥ sthāpanam īritam* 'He should bestow a name on the deity conjoined with the name of the patron and ending in -svāmin or -mādhava. I have [thus] explained the installation of Viṣṇus'.

[151] D.C. Sircar, *EI* 37:13, p. 64.

[152] Sircar 1983a, Supplement:3, ll. 42–43 (Bhavadeva); Mitra 1971, p. 245 (Bhavadevamahāvihāra). *EI* 41:22, ll. 19–20 (Rājyapāla); the final colophon of ASB, MS 40785 dated in 1289; see Shastri 1917, p. 117 (Madhusena). Shastri 1920, p. 243, ll. 2–3, 6 (Udayavarāha). Tripathy 1930, p. 466, l. 24 (Dhruvānanda). *EI* 29:26, ll. 25–26 (Devānanda). *EI* 26:45, l. 14 (Kāntideva). The exact location of Harikela is uncertain, but it may be placed with some confidence in the area of Chittagong, that is to say, near Samataṭa in the direction of Arakan.

praised only for his learning in poetry, the Epics, and the Purāṇas. Mention is made not of his religion but of that of his wife Bindurati, who is said to have been a devotee of Śiva.[153]

The Pāla Emperors and the Great Monasteries of Eastern India

With the Pāla emperors we come to what appears to be the most robustly Buddhist of all the dynasties of our period. Like the Candras of southeast Bengal they chose the wheel of the Buddha's teaching (*dharmacakram*) as the seal-symbol on their charters; they began their inscriptions with obseisance to the Buddha; and the following among them appear with the epithet *paramasaugataḥ* in the lacunose record of inscriptions and manuscript colophons: Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812), Devapāla (r. c. 812–850), Mahendrapāla (850–865+), Nārāyaṇapāla (r. c. 865+–917), Vigrahapāla II (r. c. 972–977), Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027), Nayapāla (r. c. 1027–1043), Vigrahapāla III (r. c. 1043–1070), Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), and Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161).[154]

Under these rulers eastern India witnessed an extraordinary development of Mahāyāna Buddhism in all its branches, particularly in the Tantric Way of Mantras (Mantranaya),[155] which if not entirely the product of this region was very largely so; and this immense creativity, whose products formed in due course the basis of the Buddhism of Inner Asia, was nurtured and refined in a number of major monasteries, of which the most eminent were those of Nālandā, Vikramaśīla, Somapura, Trikaṭuka, Uddaṇḍapura, and Jagaddala.[156] That the

---

[153] *EI* 26:45, ll. 3–: *...jayaty udāro durvāramāravisarasya jayī jinendraḥ || tadbhaktibalitaśaktir bhujadvayaurjityavijitaripudarpaḥ | sa jayati dharmaikarataḥ khyātaḥ śrībhadradatto yaḥ || tasya subhāṣitabhāratapurāṇarāmāyaṇārthavit tanayaḥ | nāmnā śrīdhanadattaḥ prakaṭitamahimānvayo yo 'bhūt || tasya gaurī mahābhūbhṛtsutā budhagurustutā | patnī binduratir nāma yā babhūva śivapriyā* 'Victorious is the foremost of the Jinas, the exalted one who conquered the multitude of Māras so hard to ward off. His power intensified by devotion to him, the pride of his enemies overcome by the strength of his two arms, solely devoted to the Dharma, victorious is the famous Bhadradatta. His son was Dhanadatta. He understood the meaning of elegant poetry, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, and the Rāmāyaṇa, and his uninterrupted greatness was made manifest [to all]. His wife was Bindumati, the fair-skinned daughter of a great king, praised by the learned and her elders, a devotee of Śiva'.

[154] **Dharmapāla:** *EI* 4:34, ll. 29–30; *EI* 17:17, ll. 24–25; *EI* 18:30, l. 28. **Devapāla:** *EI* 17:17, ll. 24–25; *EI* 18:30, l. 29. **Mahendrapāla:** *EI* 42:2, ll. 30–31. **Nārāyaṇapāla:** Sircar 1983a:17, ll. 28–29. **Vigrahapāla II:** *EI* 29:1A, ll. 27–28. **Mahīpāla I:** *EI* 14:23, ll. 29–30; *EI* 29:1, l. 27; a pedestal inscription (Huntington 1984, pp. 221–222). **Nayapāla:** colophon of a MS transcribed in Bendall 1883, p. 175. **Vigrahapāla III:** *EI* 15:18, l. 23; *EI* 29:1B, ll. 26–27; *EI* 29:7, ll. 24–25; MS colophon transcribed in Bendall 1902, pp. 232–233 (because the date of copying is said here to be the 26th year of the reign of Vigrahapāla this can only refer to Vigrahapāla III). **Rāmapāla:** Regmi 1965–1966, Pt. 1, p. 148 (MS colophon); colophon of *Kubjikāmata*, NAK MS 1-1633, NGMPP B25/22 (transcribed in Goudriaan and Schoterman 1988, p. 6); a pedestal inscription (Huntington 1984, pp. 233–234). **Madanapāla:** Mukherji and Maity 1967:30, ll. 31–32. The dates of the reigns given here are those proposed by D.C. Sircar (1975–1976), with the addition of those of Mahendrapāla. The existence of a Pāla Mahendrapāla, son and successor of Devapāla, was established only with the publication of the Māldā District Museum copper-plate charter of that king in 1992 (*EI* 42:2) by K.V. Ramesh and S. Subramonia Iyer, following its discovery in 1989.

---

[155] The Derge edition of the Tripiṭaka contains 486 works (Tōh. 360–845) in the section of the Kanjur devoted to scriptural Tantric works and 2606 (Tōh. 1180–3785) in the section of the Tenjur devoted to works of Tantric scholarship, comprising commentaries on the Buddhist Tantras and works setting out observances (Sādhana, Bali, Pratiṣṭhā etc.) based on them. All claim to be translations of Sanskrit originals and this claim is true in the great majority of cases. In addition there are numerous works surviving whole or in citation in Sanskrit that appear not to have been translated into Tibetan; and some of these, such as the *Gūḍhapadā* of Advayavajra, the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Padmaśrīmitra, the *Vajrajvālodayā* of Ānandagarbha, the *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, the *Sarvadevasamāgama*, and the *Herukasādhana* of Kalyāṇagarbha, have been used in this study.

[156] The Nālandāmahāvihāra was located in Bihar about 55 miles southeast of Patna, with the Uddaṇḍapuramahāvihāra close by. The Vikramaśīlamahāvihāra was very probably at Antichak in the Bhāgalpur District of Bihar about 19 miles from Bhāgalpur town. No evidence conclusively etablishes this. But the huge size of the monastery excavated at Antichak severely narrows the field of known possibilities; and there is suggestive archaeological evidence: a copper seal was uncovered in the ruins of the monastery with the legend *vikramasya* (*IAR*, 1973–4, p. 9) and a damaged inscription on a Stūpa there contains the syllables *vikrama*... (HUNTINGTON 1984, pp. 125–126). The use of Vikrama for Vikramaśīla is seen in Anupamavajra's *Ādikarmapradīpa*; see here p. 91. That the name of the monastery was Vikramaśīla rather than Vikramaśīlā, as it appears in some secondary sources, is clear from, e.g., the scribal colophon of a manuscript of Vajragarbha's *Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭīkā* that was penned there: *śrīmadvikramaśīlamahāvihāre lekhāpitaṃ*. The Somapuramahāvihāra was at Pāhāṛpur about 29 miles northwest of Mahāsthān (ancient Puṇḍravardhana) in Varendrī, the region of northern Bengal between the arms of the Ganges and Karatoyā rivers (*Rāmacarita* 3.10ab: *apy abhito gaṅgākaratoyānarghapravāhapuṇyatamām*. The Jagaddalamahāvihāra too was in this region; see *Rāmacarita* 3.7: ...*jagaddalamahāvihāracitarāgām* | *dadhatīm lokeśam api mahattārodīritorumahimānam* '[the land (of Varendrī)], whose beauty was heightened by the Jagaddalamahāvihāra, which was home to Lokeśvara, its extensive glory proclaimed by [a] great [image of] Tārā'. Its site has beeen tentatively identified as the mound at modern Jagdal in the Dhamoirhat Upazila of the Naogaon District of the Rajshahi Division of Bangladesh. A one-season, small-scale excavation of this mound was undertaken by Bangladesh's Department of Archaeology in the winter of 1996. Though it revealed evidence of the presence of a Buddhist monastery and unearthed a fine statue of Heruka and his consort, most of the site was left untouched and nothing has been reported that raises to certainty the high probability that this was the Jagaddalamahāvihāra. See ZAKARIA 1994 and MIAH 1997/8. The location of the Trikaṭukavihāra is as yet unknown, but Tāranātha relates a myth that on instructions from Mahākāla king Devapāla unearthed this monastery beneath a sand dune when he was crossing Rārā (=Rāḍhā) (*HBI*, p. 267; MAJUMDAR 1971, p. 525), the region of Bengal south of Varendrī and west of the Bhagīrathī river, divided into Uttararāḍhā, covering part of Birbhum District and

Pālas' devotion to the Buddha was expressed, as we might expect, in the creation and support of these great monastic universities is shown by terracotta seals found amid their remains, and by the *Rgya gar chos 'byung* ('The Arising of the Dharma in India'), a Tibetan account of the history of Indian Buddhism written in 1608.

Tāranātha, the author of this work, tells us that he wrote it on the basis of three Sanskrit sources that are now lost or inaccessible. The first is an unnamed work in 2,000 verses by a scholar of Magadha named Sa dbang bzang po, that is to say, Kṣmendrabhadra or a synonym such as Dharaṇīndrabhadra. This covered the history of the religion up to the time of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126). The second is the *Buddhapurāṇa*, a work by Dbang pos sbyin (Indradatta) in 1,200 verses, which went beyond Rāmapāla to cover the successor dynasty of the Senas of Gauḍa. It may therefore be supposed to have been composed in that part of India, like the work of Kṣmendrabhadra. The third is a work of similar length covering the succession of Ācāryas and written by a brahmin scholar whom Tāranātha calls Bhaṭāghaṭī. This name is implausible as it stands. If, as is probable, it is is deformation of Vandyaghaṭīya, then it identifies him as a member of a well-known Rāḍhīya brahmin lineage of Bengal (> Bandyopādhyāya, Banerjee).[157] Tāranātha claims to have relied primarily on the first of these three works, that is to say, for his account up to the time of Rāmapāla, since that source went no further.[158] For the period of the Senas, who succeeded the Pālas, he must have relied on Indradatta alone. As for Vandyaghaṭīya's account of the succession of Ācāryas, it is probable that it consisted of, or extended to. an account of the succession of the Tantric Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla from its foundation in the eighth century to its destruction around 1200 by the forces of Muḥāmmad Bakhtyār Khaljī. For he adds a section in the manner of a supplement on the Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla after his treatment of the periods covered by his first two sources. His work, then, derives from Indian tradition, and while his sources were evidently inaccurate for the early history of Buddhism, we might expect them, particularly the work of Kṣmendrabhadra,

---

the whole of Burdwan District, and Dakṣiṇarāḍhā, covering Bankura District and the non-coastal part of Midnapur District.

[157] In the eulogy of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, the learned minister of Harivarman (c. 1090+), in a stone inscription from Bhubaneswar, Bhavadeva's mother Saṅgokā is said to be the daughter of a Vandyaghaṭīya brahmin (*EI* 6:17B, v. 13). Other Vandyaghaṭīyas are the Sarvānanda who in 1159 wrote a commentary *Ṭīkāsarvasva* on the *Liṅgānuśāsana* of Amarasiṃha, the great 16th-century Dharmaśāstrin Raghunandana, author of the *Smṛtitattva* (PINGREE 1994, p. 341), Nārāyaṇa (*fl.* c. 1681), author of the *Smṛtisarvasva* or *Smṛtitattva* (PINGREE 1994, p. 181), and Dvija Lakṣmaṇa, who translated the *Ādikāṇḍa* of the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* into Bengali.

[158] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, pp. 215, l. 22–214, l. 10; *HBI*, p. 350.

to be more reliable in their account of what for them was recent history.[159] The *Rgya gar chos 'byung* therefore deserves close attention.

Tāranātha attributes to Dharmapāla the building of the monastery of Vikramaśīla and to Devapāla the building of the monasteries of Somapura and Trikaṭuka.[160] In this, however, he or his sources are confused. The claim that the monastery at Somapura was founded by Devapāla is contradicted by a terracotta seal found at the site bearing the legend *śrīsomapure śrīdharmmapāladevamahāvihāre* 'in the Mahāvihāra of Dharmapāladeva at Somapura',[161] thereby indicating that it was founded not by Devapāla but by his father Dharmapāla. Evidence also contradicts Tāranātha's claim that it was Devapāla that built the Trikaṭuka monastery. For Haribhadra reports at the end of his *Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka*, his great commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, that he composed it in this monastery during the reign of Dharmapāla and under his patronage.[162]

---

[159] After his account of the Tantric Ācāryas who held office successively at Vikramaśīla Tāranātha offers brief treatments of various topics not covered by these sources. Buddhism in mainland Southeast Asia and in maritime Southeast Asia, Sri Lanka and the South is covered in ch. 39 and 40 respectively. On these topics, he says, he has seen no comprehensive work. Ch. 41 treats the spread of Buddhism in the Deccan following another lost work, the *Flower-Garland*, by a brahmin Manomati, which, he says, contained a brief account of this subject. Ch. 42 covers the divisions of the main Nikāyas, evidently on the basis of such Indian treatments of the topic as the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* of Vinītadeva; ch. 43 examines what he rightly considers to the muddled theories of the origin of the Mantranaya; and ch. 44 gives some notes on the various Indian schools of image-makers. This is followed by the account of his use of his sources. He notes that he has no written sources for the later events in his account that were not covered in those works. For these events he has relied on what he judged to be trustworthy oral reports.

[160] See *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 160, ll. 9–10 (Somapuravihāra); p. 161, l. 11 (*dpal tsha ba gsum gtsug lag khang* [Trikaṭukavihāra]; cf. p. 167, ll. 7–8: *tri ka *ṭu* [corr. : *ṭa* Ed.] *ka tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang*); p. 165, l. 17 (Vikramaśīlavihāra); *HBI*, p. 266, p. 267, pp. 274–275.

[161] *ARE* 1927–28, pp. 105–106; DIKSHIT 1938, pp. 20 and 90, and plate LIX*h*; N.G. MAJUMDAR in *EI* 21:16, p. 98.

[162] *Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka*, p. 994, vv. 6–7: *khyāto yo bhuvi puṇyakīrtinicayo vidvajjanālaṃkṛtas tasmin sarvaguṇākare trikaṭukaśrīmadvihāre śubhe | dānāl labdhamahodayasya karuṇādevasya dharmātmanaḥ sānāthyena sukhopadhānanilaye sthitvā vivekāspade || krudhyatkuñjarakumbhapīṭhadalanavyāsaktaśaktyātmanaḥ puṇyābhyāsakṛtābhiyogajavaśāt saṃpatsamādāyinaḥ | rājye rājyabhaṭādivaṃśapatitaśrīdharmapālasya vai tattvālokavidhāyinī viracitā satpañjikeyaṃ mayā* 'I have composed this excellent commentary that illuminates reality after taking up residence in the splendid Trikaṭukavihāra that is famed throughout the world, the site of a mass of sacred edifices, adorned by learned men, a store of all the virtues, where [all] the means of happiness are to be found, a place of insight, through the support of the compassionate king Dharma[pāla], who by means of donation has achieved pre-eminence[; and I have done so] during the reign of this king, who born in the dynasty that descends from Rājyabhaṭa, full of power devoted to the rending

In the case of the Somapura monastery it has been argued that we may salvage Tāranātha's credibility by concluding that Devapāla did found this monastery, as Tāranātha claims, and that he gave it his father's name rather than his own out of filial piety.[163] This is indeed a practice of which there are other examples, its purpose being to transfer to the person named the religious merit generated by the creation and use of the foundation; but it is much more probable that Tāranātha is in error here, as he clearly is in the case of the Trikaṭuka monastery. For his history commits the fundamental error of reversing the true sequence of the two reigns, placing that of Devapāla before that of Dharmapāla.[164] His attribution of the founding of Somapura and Trikaṭuka to Devapāla rather than Dharmapāla can, then, readily be explained as the result of this reversal. We may therefore suspect that his attribution of the founding of Vikramaśīla to Dharmapāla suffers from the same dislocation and that its true founder was his son Devapāla. That this suspicion is correct is confirmed by the *Ādikarmapradīpa* of Anupamavajra. For in its conclusion he tells us that he compiled the work following the instruction of Dharmākara, a monk whom he describes as "residing in the monastery called Vikrama constructed by king Devapāla".[165] Vikrama here is evidently a *bhīmavat* contraction for Vikramaśīla.[166] However, we may not conclude that everything that Tāranātha attributes to Dharmapāla was Devapāla's doing, and *vice versa*. He reports, for

---

of the swollen globes on the foreheads of the furious elephants [of his enemies], has attained his glorious success by virtue of the dedication produced by his repeated pious works'. For the use of *sthitvā* here cf. the final verse of the *Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya cited here, p. 82.

[163] N.G. MAJUMDAR in *EI* 21:16, p. 98, fn. 5.

[164] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, chapters 29 (Devapāla) and 30 (Dharmapāla). Tāranātha gives the order Gopāla > Devapāla > Rāsapāla > Dharmapāla; see *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, pp. 163–164: *rgyal po de wa pā las lo bzhi bcu brgyad du rgyal srid byas | de'i rjes su sras rā sa pā la rgyal srid lo bcu gnis byas* 'King Devapāla ruled for forty-eight years. After him his son Rāsapāla ruled for twelve'. No Rāsapāla appears in the accounts of the dynasty given in the Pālas' inscriptions. The name is perhaps a deformation of Rājyapāla (r.c. 917-952), the successor of Nūrūyaṇapāla.

[165] *Ādikarmapradīpa*, ed. Takahashi, p. 153: *vīhāre* (T [metri causa] : *vihāre* P, Ed.) **nṛpadevapālaracite* (T, Ed. : *ndapadevaracita* P) **śrīvikramākhye* (T, Ed. : *śrīvikramākṣa* P) *sthitaḥ śrīmatsaugataśāsanaikatilakaḥ khyāto 'dvitīyaḥ kṛtī | *śīlāḍhyaś cirabrahmacaryacarito* (P : *śīlāḍhyasthiratattvadṛṣtimahito* T, Ed.) *dharmākaraḥ *śāntadhīs* (P : *sanmatiḥ* T, Ed.) **tasyādeśakaraḥ samasty anupamaḥ* (T, Ed. : **tasyādeśakaro babhūva 'nupamas* P) *tenādikarmoddhṛtam* '[This text on] the initial observance has been extracted [from various sources] by Anupama, acting on the instruction of Dharmākara, that renowned, unequalled scholar, richly endowed with morality. of tranquil mind, a life-long observer of celibacy, a resident of the Vikrama monastery constructed by King Devapāla'.

[166] On Vikrama for Vikramaśīla see here p. 88.

example, Dharmapāla's particular reverence for Haribhadra,[167] a relationship that, as we have seen, Haribhadra himself attests. He also claims that Dharmapāla created about fifty religious foundations (*dharmādhikārāḥ*), and that the majority, thirty-five, were for the study of the *Prajñāpāramitā* texts.[168] It is at least probable that this bias was due to the influence of Haribhadra, given the latter's close relationship with Dharmapāla and the fact that he was the pre-eminent scholar of his age in the exegesis of this literature.

As for the monastery of Uddaṇḍapura, which was located near the more ancient monastery of Nālandā, Bu ston, in his history of Buddhism in India and Tibet, completed in 1322, attributes its foundation to Dharmapāla;[169] and the

---

[167] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 167, ll. 7–9: *de nas mi ring bar rgyal po dha rma pā las spyan drangs ste | tri ka *ṭu* (corr. : *ṭa* Ed.) *ka tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang du bzhugs nas | sher phyin nyan pa stong phrag mang po la chos ston cing | brgyad stong 'grel chen la sogs pa bstan bcos kyang mang du mdzad* 'Not long after this [Haribhadra] was invited by King Dharmapāla. He stayed in the Trikaṭukavihāra and taught the *Prajñāpāramitā* to many thousands of hearers. He also composed [his] detailed commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, and many other learned works'; *HBI*, p. 277.

[168] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 165, ll. 14–17: *rgyal srid du 'khod ma thag nas shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'chad pa po rnams spyan drangs | slob dpon seng ge bzang po la khyad par du mos | rgyal po 'dis spyir chos gzhi lnga bcu tsam btsug pa las | sher phyin 'chad pa'i chos bzhi sum cu so lnga yod* 'As soon as [Dharmapāla] was reigning he invited teachers of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. He had particular faith in Ācārya Haribhadra. This king set up about fifty religious foundations (*dharmādhikāraḥ*) and thirty-five of them were for the exegesis of the *Prajñāpāramitā*'; *HBI* p. 274. For evidence that *chos gzhi* renders Sanskrit *dharmādhikāraḥ* and that the latter means 'a religious foundation' rather than 'a centre for the Doctrine', as it is translated in *HBI* p. 274 see here p. 104.

[169] OBERMILLER 1986, p. 156–157. For the proximity to Nālandā of the monastery of Uddaṇḍapura, which in Tibetan sources is known as Otantapurī, see *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 156, l. 19: *o ta nta pu ri dang nye ba na nā le ndra zhes bya ba'i gtsug lag khang zhig bzhengs* 'He built the Nālandā monastery near Otantapuri'; *HBI*, p. 258. I use Uddaṇḍapura because this is what we find in a pedestal inscription found at Bihār Sharīf in the Patna District (CHOUDHARY 1958, p. 65; HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 213, no. 19): *deyadharmmo yaṃ śrīnārāyaṇapāladevarājye samvat 54 śrī-uddaṇḍapuravāstavyarāṇaka-uccaputraṭhārukasya* 'This is the pious gift of Ṭhāruka, son of Ucha, resident at the Great Monastery of Uddaṇḍapura, in year 54 of the reign of Nārāyaṇapāladeva'. Bihār Sharīf is indeed near Nālandā. The form Uddaṇḍapura also occurs in an inscription of the reign of Śūrapāla recording the installation of a Buddha image in the monastery there by a monk Pūrṇadāsa (CHOUDHARY 1958, p. 54). As for the Nālandāmahāvihāra, it long predates the Pālas. Faxian (d. before 423) describes the major Buddhist edifices in this area but is silent about Nālandā, which implies that if it existed it was certainly not an institution likely to have been home to the great names of the early Mahāyāna. The *Da Tang Da Ciensi sanzang fashi zhuan*, the biography of Xuanzang (ordained between 609 and 617; left for India in 627 or 629; studied at Nālandā; d. 664) written by his disciple Huili and later continued and edited by Yancong in 688, contains an account of the history of Nālandā (BEAL 1914, pp. 110–113), from which

probability that this report is accurate is increased by the fact that he, unlike Tāranātha, knew that Dharmapāla came before not after Devapāla. Tāranātha assigns it to Devapāla, probably in consequence of the aforesaid confusion, though he also reports a tradition that it was founded by Dharmapāla's father Gopāla, the first of the Pālas.[170]

Tāranātha reports that Dharmapāla adopted two persons as his preceptors: Haribhadra and his pupil Buddhajñāna. While the former was a master of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, the latter was a renowned authority on the Tantric system taught in the *Guhyasamāja*.[171] We are told that he performed the rituals for the consecration of the Vikramaśīla monastery and was appointed as its Vajrācārya. We also learn that, having seen omens of the future ruin of the dynasty under Dharmapāla's grandson, he persuaded the king to institute a regular fire-sacrifice (*homaḥ*) to be performed under his guidance by the Tantric officiants of this monastery with the purpose of ensuring that the dynasty would be long-lived and consequently that Buddhism would be widely disseminated. It was performed, we are told, for many years at huge expense.[172] Further evidence of

---

it appears that it began as a small Saṅghārāma donated by the fourth Gupta king, Kumāragupta Śakrāditya, who reigned from 415 to 455. It then grew through the addition of further Vihāras until by Xuanzang's time it had become the foremost Buddhist structure in India, famed throughout Buddhist Asia as a centre of learning. See the analysis of the history of the Nālandāmahāvihāra on the basis of the Chinese sources in KUWAYAMA 1988, pp. 7–11. For a plan of Nālandā with its row of nine identical monasteries and several temples see MICHELL 1990, p. 246.

[170] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 158, ll. 7–8: *rgyal po go pā la 'di 'am de wa pā la'i mtshams su dpal o ta nta pūri'i gtsug lag khang bzhengs* 'The Otantapurī monastery was built in the period of this king Gopāla or that of Devapāla'; *HBI*, p. 262.

[171] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 165, ll. 10–12: *seng bzang yes shes zhabs bla mar bsten | shes byin dang | dpal gsang ba 'dus pas phyogs thams cad gang bar mdzad | gsang ba 'dus pa dang* 'He served Haribhadra and [Buddha]jñānapāda as his preceptors, and filled all the directions with the *Prajñāpāramitā* and the *Guhyasamāja*'; *HBI*, p. 274. See also *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 195, ll. 12–14: *bi kra ma shī lar sngags kyi rdo rje slob dpon chen po sangs rgyas ye shes zhabs dang | der rjes mar me mdzad bzang pos bstan pa bskyangs* 'At Vikramaśīla [first] the Mantra-Vajrācārya Mahāpaṇḍita Buddhajñānapāda and then Dīpāṅkarabhadra protected the teaching [of the Buddha]'; *HBI*, p. 325. This figure, known variously as Jñānapāda (Ye shes zhabs), Buddhajñāna (Sangs rgyas ye shes), and Buddhaśrījñāna (Sangs rgyas dpal ye shes), is a crucial figure in the history of the Mantranaya, being the source of the "Jñānapāda" school of *Guhyasamāja* exegesis and practice that was introduced into Tibet by Rin chen bzang po. See *Blue Annals*, pp. 367–374 for an account of his life and works, and their transmission to and in Tibet. Notable among his writings are the *Samantabhadrasādhana* (Tōh. 1856) and his commentary on the *Guhyasamāja* (Tōh. 1852).

[172] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 168, ll. 6–12: *rgyal po dha rma pā la la | khyod kyi tsha bo'i dus nas rgyal srid 'jig pa'i mtshan ma yod pas | sbyin sreg gi cho ga chen po zhig byas na yun ring du srid zin cing | chos kyang dar bar 'gyur gsungs pas | des kyang dngul to la 'bum phrag dgu dang nyis stong gi yo byad phul bas | slob dpon*

Dharmapāla's commitment to Buddhism is found in the Nesarikā grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III issued in 805, since that reveals that the ensign depicted on his war banner was the Buddhist goddess Tārā.[173]

As for Gopāla (r. c. 750–775), the father of Dharmapāla, whom all our sources make the first of the Pālas, there is no evidence in the inscriptions that he too was a Buddhist, unless it be his having been referred to in inscriptions of Nārāyaṇapāla (r. c. 860–917) and Vigrahapāla III (r. c. 1043–1070) as a second Buddha.[174] However, the *Rājavyākaraṇa* claims him for the faith, saying that after a dissolute youth he converted to Buddhism and constructed various monasteries, Caityas, and temples.[175] Tāranātha likewise claims that he served the cause of Buddhism by founding many monasteries, both in Bengal, which he ruled in the first part of his career, and Magadha, when he had added that great province to his kingdom through conquest.[176] He also recounts a legend according to which Gopāla, when not yet king, found a jewel and used it as the fee for Tantric consecration from an Ācārya. He then successfully propitiated the Buddhist goddess Cundā following his instructions,[177] went to the monastery of Khasarpaṇa Avalokiteśvara,[178] and successfully prayed to him for kingship, which the deity promised he would obtain if he moved east.

In his account of Buddhism under the successors of Gopāla, Dharmapāla, and Devapāla, Tāranātha gives us one more report of royal monastery building. But unfortunately his sources seem to have been so misinformed in their presentation of the order and identity of these subsequent kings that it is no easy task to discern the reign to which this building activity should be assigned. He tells us that Mahāpāla, whom he claims to have been the son and successor of Mahīpāla, built the Uruvāsa monastery, described as a branch of the monastery at Uddaṇḍapura, and founded Buddhist establishments at the monasteries of Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuka.[179] Tāranātha has his Mahīpāla rule for

---

gtso bor gyur pa'i rdo rje 'dzin pa rnams kyis lo mang por sbyin sreg mdzad 'He told King Dharmapāla: "There are signs that from the time of your grandson onwards the kingdom will be endangered. If you perform a great ritual of fire-sacrifice you will ensure that the reign [of your line] will endure for many years and also that the Dharma will be disseminated". And so [the king] had the fire-sacrifice done for many years by Vajradharas led by the Ācārya [Buddhajñānapāda], offering substances worth 902,000 tolas of silver'; *HBI*, p. 278. The ritual was evidently a *śāntihomaḥ*, a sacrifice for the averting of disaster. Such rituals are generic but they are made to serve the specific purposes of the patron by writing these into the formula of intention (*saṃkalpaḥ*) that must be recited at the opening of any such ritual; see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 357–358 and fn. 22 in a discussion of the Tantric Śaiva ritual commissioned by the Khmer ruler Jayavarman II (r. 802–c. 835) "in order that this land of Kambuja [Kambujadeśa] should not continue to be a dependency of Javā and so that only one king should be univeral ruler [in this region]" (K. 235, Khmer, C ll. 71–75: *vraḥ pāda parameśvara añjen thve vidhi leha leṅ kampi kamvujadeśa neḥ āyatta ta javā ley leṅ āc ti kamrateṅ phdai karoṃ mvāy guḥ ta jā cakravartti*).

[173] *EI* 34:19, ll. 35–38, at the end of an enumeration of the ensigns ([*rāja*]*cihnāni*) siezed by Govinda III from his enemies, beginning with those of the Pāṇḍya and Pallava kings: *pāṇḍyadeśādhipān matsyaṃ vṛṣabhaṃ pallaveśvarāt* | ... *tārābhagava*tīṃ* (em. : *ti* Ep.) *khyātāṃ dharmād baṅgālabhūmipāt* || *ittham etāny athānyāni cihnāny ādāya bhūbhujām* | *garuḍāṅkaṃ jagattuṅgo vyadhatta sakalaṃ jagat* 'Thus by siezing these and other royal ensigns—the fish from the king of Pāṇḍyadeśa, the bull from the Pallava king ... and the famous Tārā from Dharma[pāla], the king of Bengal—[Govinda III] Jagattuṅga placed the whole earth under [the sway of] his Garuḍa'.

[174] The Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla (HULTZSCH 1886), ll. 4–5 and the Bangaon plate of Vigrahapāla III (CHOUDHARY 1958, p. 83), ll.. 3–4: *sa śrīmān lokanātho jayati daśabalo 'nyaś ca gopāladevaḥ*.

[175] *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 53.628–631.

[176] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 156, ll. 18–21: *sku che'i stod la bhaṃ ga la la dbang bsgyur* | *smad la ma ga dha yang dbang du bsnungs te* | *o ta nta pu ri dang nye ba nā le ndra zhes bya ba'i gtsug lag khang zhig bzhengs* | *yul chen po de gnyis su dge 'dun gyi sde mang du btsugs te bstan pa la mchod pa rgya chen po mdzad do* 'In the first part of his life he governed Vaṅgāla. In the subsequent part he subjected Magadha. Near Uddaṇḍapura he built a monastery called Nālendra. By establishing many divisions of the Saṅgha [in monasteries] in these two large regions he greatly honoured the religion [of the Buddha]; *HBI*, p. 258.

[177] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 155, l. 14–156, l. 18; *HBI*, pp. 257–258. Cundā, though she appears not have been a major constituent of learned Tantric Buddhism, seems to have been popular in the region. Two bronze statues of this goddess have been found in Pāla territory, one from Kurkihār cast in the reign of Mahīpāla I, and the other from Nālandā, assigned by HUNTINGTON on stylistic grounds to the ninth century (HUNTINGTON 1984, pp. 60–61, 226–227, and 144; figs. 61 and 169; wrongly giving the name as Cuṇḍā); and there was a temple of Cundā in Paṭṭikera (Maināmatī) near Comilla, which is illustrated in a manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (ULC MS Add. 1643, copied in 1015), as one of eighty-five illustrations of Buddhist sacred sites, most in eastern India, with the legend *paṭṭikere cundāvarabhavane cundā* (MITRA 1971, p. 244). There are images of Cundā from Ratnagiri, Udayagiri, and Achutrajpur in Orissa, Ellora in Maharashtra, Gujarat, and Nepal; see SHAW 2006, pp. 265–274; *IAR* 2001–02, Plate 114 (Udayagiri).

[178] In *HBI* (p. 257) it appears as "the temple of *ārya* *Khasarpaṇa". But the Tibetan states that it was a monastery: *'phags kha sa rpa ṇa'i gtsug lag khang* (*Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 155, ll. 20–21). A Khasarpaṇa located in Rāḍhā is mentioned in the *Zhib mo rdo rje* of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po (c. 1198–1259) as very famous in the time of 'Brog mi, who died c. 1064 (*Blue Annals*, p. 72); see *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 86, §4: *rgyar gar shar phyogs ra ḍa na 'phags pa spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug 'khar sa pa ni bzhugs pa de grags pa che pas* .... Perhaps this was the site of the monastery referred to here.

[179] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 175, l. 2–7: *o ta nta pu ri'i gtsug lag khang du nyan thos kyi dge 'dun rnams gtso bor mchod cing* | *dge slong lnga brgya dang chos ston pa lnga bcu la 'tsho bo sbyar* | *de yi lan yag tu u ru bā sa zhes bya ba'i gtsug lag khang bzhengs* | *der yang nyan thos pa se ndha pa lnga brgya re la 'tsho ba sbyor* | *bi kra ma shī lar sngar gyi srol de ka gzung ste* | *mchod 'os kyi mthil du mdzad* | *dpal nā le ndār yang chos gzhi 'ga' re btsugs* | *so ma pu ri dang* | *nā le ndra dang* | *tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang la sogs par yang chos gzhi mang po btsugs* '[Mahāpāla] honoured principally the community of Śrāvakas in the Uddaṇḍapuravihāra and [there] pro-

fifty-two years and says that he died at about the same time as the Tibetan king Khri ral,[180] that is to say, **Khri** gtsug lde brtsan also called **Ral** pa can, who ruled from about 815 to 836; and his son Mahāpāla is assigned a reign of 41 years,[181] that is to say, up to about 900. Now, there are two Mahīpālas known to us from the epigraphical record, both of whom were much later, the first ruling c. 977–1027 and the second c. 1070–1071; but there is no Mahāpāla. The similarity with the name of his father raises the suspicion that one king Mahīpāla, no doubt Mahīpāla I, the length of his reign agreeing closely with that attributed to Mahīpāla by Tāranātha, has become Mahīpāla and Mahāpāla, and that the resulting two reigns, amounting implausibly to ninety-three years, served to bridge a gulf of ignorance of the period between the great founders of the Pāla empire and Mahīpāla I, who restored the fortunes of the Pālas after a period during which, following Devapāla, they had lapsed into insignificance, losing control of Bengal and retreating into a core territory in Bihar around modern Patna.[182] It is probable, then, that Tāranātha's attribution to Mahāpāla of the expansion of Uddaṇḍapura and the founding of Buddhist establishments at Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuka is a distortion of a record of the pious works of Mahīpāla I. The supposition is somewhat strengthened by the fact that Tāranātha says that the *Kālacakratantra* was introduced during the latter half of Mahīpāla's life and that it spread during the reign of Mahāpāla.[183] For it was during the reign of Mahīpāla I that this new Tantric system emerged.[184]

---

vided for five hundred monks and fifty teachers of the Dharma. As a branch of this he built a monastery called Uruvāsa. In this too he provided for five hundred Saindhava Śrāvakas. He accepted that the pre-existing system at Vikramaśīla should remain unchanged; but he made [Uruvāsa] the object of his greatest veneration. He also established several religious foundations at Nālandā, and many others also in Somapura, Nālendra, and the Trikaṭukavihāra'; *HBI*, p. 289.

[180] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 172, ll. 1–3: *de nas rgyal po ba na pā la'i sras ma hi pā la zhes pa byung | rgyal srid lo lnga bcu nga gnyis mdzad | rags rtsis su byas na rgyal po 'di 'das tsam na | bod na btsan po khri ral yang sku 'das pa tsam gyi dus yin no* 'Next, the son of Vanapāla, called Mahīpāla, ruled for fifty-two years. By a rough calculation this king died at the same time as King Khri ral in Tibet'; *HBI*, p. 284.

[181] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 175, l. 1: *de 'i sras ni rgyal po ma hā pā la ste | 'dis rgyal srid lo bzhi bcu zhe gcig mdzad* 'His son was King Mahāpāla. He ruled for forty-one years'; *HBI*, p. 289.

[182] See SMITH 1962, pp. 412–418; and KULKE in KULKE and ROTHERMUND 1992, p. 118.

[183] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 175, ll. 7–9: *rgyal po ma hi pā la'i sku tshe'i smad tsam na | pi ṭo ā tsā ryas dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud spyan drangs te | rgyal po 'di'i dus su dar bar mdzad* 'The Ācārya Piṭo introduced the *Kālacakratantra* in the second half of the life of King Mahīpāla and disseminated it during the time of this king [Mahāpāla]'; *HBI*, pp. 289–290. This Piṭo is no doubt the person elsewhere called Piṇḍo (Bsod nyoms); see *Blue Annals*, p. 756–757, 789; OROFINO 1994, p. 23.

[184] NEWMAN 1987 and 1998; OROFINO 1994, p. 23.

After Mahīpāla the monastic universities already established continued to flourish, but Pāla fortunes once again went into decline, and it is therefore not surprising that Tāranātha has no major royal benefactions to report during this period. However, during the long reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), the last major ruler of this dynasty, the kingdom recovered, and we might expect this to be reflected in a renewal of material patronage. It is tempting therefore to accept the claim made by Hara Prasad SHASTRI in 1910[185] and repeated by many since that time[186] that the Jagaddalamahāvihāra,[187] the one great monastery in the Pāla domains whose founder has not yet been identified, was the creation of this monarch. But there is no evidence that supports this claim[188]

Nor is there any that refutes it. In the introduction to the edition of the *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* published by KOSAMBI and GOKHALE the former has asserted on the strength of evidence provided by the latter that Rāmapāla's coronation took place in this monastery,[189] in which case, of course, it could not have been founded by him during his reign. But that too cannot be accepted. The evidence cited is GOKHALE's rendering of the colophonic verse at the end of the **Bhagavatyāmnyāyānusāriṇī vyākhyā*, a commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* which survives in Tibetan translation (Tōh. 3811):[190] "This *vyākhyā* was composed by Rāja-jagaddala-nivāsī [which thus becomes the writer's name] at the Jagaddala vihāra, which was the place of Rāmapāla's coronation".[191] But this rendering is wildly inaccurate. The meaning of the Tibetan is: "I, a resident of the venerable Rājajagaddala [monastery], have composed this commentary, a string of pearls (*muktāvalī*) [to be an adornment] of the land protected by King Rāmapāla".[192] This does at least convey the valuable information that the monastery was a royal foundation, since the Tibetan of its name *dpal ldan rgyal po dza ga ta la*, is evidently a translation of *śrīmadrājajagaddala-*, a form of the name confirmed by its occurrence in Sanskrit at the end of Mokṣākaragupta's *Tarkabhāsā*, in which he informs us that he too was a resident of this monastery (*śrīmadrājajagaddalavihārīya-*).[193] But we remain ignorant of the king who founded it. We know that it existed in the time of Rāmapāla, and it is not impossible that it was indeed the work of this last great king of the dynasty; but no evidence of which I am aware precludes its having been created by a predecessor.

---

[185] *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin, introduction, p. 9.

[186] E.g. MOOKERJI 1951, p. 595; Rahul SANKRITYAYANA cited by KOSAMBI in KOSAMBI and GOKHALE 1957, p. xxxviii; KRISHNAMACHARYA, p. 1 of his Sanskrit introduction to *Tarkabhāṣā* (1942); MITRA 1971, p. 16; cf. HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 196.

[187] It is referred to as a Mahāvihāra in the colophonic verse of Muniśrībhadra's *Pañcakramaṭippaṇī* (*muniśrībhadreṇa cirāj jagaddalamahāvihārasadbhikṣuṇā*) and in 3.7 of the *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin (*jagaddalamahāvihāracitarāgām*).

[188] KAJIYAMA 1998, p. 7.

[189] *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, p. xxxvii, fn. 8.

[190] *bCom ldan 'das ma'i man ngag gi rjes su 'brung ba zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad pa*, f. 320r2: *mi yi dbang po rā ma pā las sa skyong mdzad pa'i <gnas kyi* [Cone, Peking]> *mu tig phreng ba ni | dpal ldan rgyal po dza ga ta la gnas par byed pa bdag gis rnam bshad 'di byas so.*

[191] *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, p. xxxvii, fn. 8.

[192] GOKHALE seems to have found his "coronation" in the *dbang* of *mi yi dbang po rā ma pā las*. The word is used in Tantric texts as a short form for *dbang bskur* 'consecration' (*abhiṣekaḥ*), as at *rGyud spyi*, p. 270, l. 1. But in order to reach his understanding of the phrase in which it occurs he has had to forget the *mi yi* that

Some idea of the scale of the Great Monasteries in the Pāla domains is provided by Tāranātha. He informs us that in the reign of Rāmapāla, even after the decline from the time of the early Pālas, there were one hundred and sixty monks holding posts as Paṇḍitas at Vikramaśīla, and that there were about a thousand monks permanently in residence, both there and at Uddaṇḍapura, with many more assembling on the occasion of festivals.[194] We also learn that when Vikramaśīla was founded its design incorporated one hundred and eight shrines: a central temple housing a life-size statue of the Great Awakening (Mahābodhi)[195] surrounded by fifty-three small temples dedicated to the inner

---

precedes—*mi yi dbang po* 'king', lit. 'lord of men', rendering Sanskrit *nṛpatiḥ*, *narendraḥ*, or a synonym—, the fact that *rā ma pā las* after it is instrumental not genitive, and the fact that the emphatic and separative particle *ni* that ends the larger phrase of which this is part and marks it out as the subject militates against its being taken as qualifying the monastery. The expression *mu tig phreng ba* describing the commentary figuratively as a string of pearls is probably also intended to convey its title by paronomasia, i.e. *Muktāvalī*, a title found elsewhere in this literature, for example as the title of Ratnākaraśānti's commentary on the *Hevajratantra*. The author remains anonymous.

[193] *Tarkabhāṣā*, p. 39. KAJIYAMA (1998, pp. 6–11) shows that Mokṣākaragupta was active at some time after c. 1050 and before c. 1292.

[194] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 189, ll. 13–19: *bi kra ma shī lar pa ṇḍi ta brgya drug cu tsam re dang | gtan du du bzhugs pa'i dge slong stong re yod cing | mchod pa la sogs pa'i dus su rab byung lnga stong re 'du | rdo rje gdan du rgyal pos tsho ba sbyar ba'i theg chen pa bzhi bcu re dang | nyan thos kyi dge slong nyis brgya re rtag tu bzhugs shing | dus dus su nyan thos kyi dge slong khri phrag re tshog pa byung | o ta nta pu rir yang rtag tu dge slong stong phrag re bzhugs | theg pa chen chung gi ste gnyis char yod cing | dus dus su rab tu byung ba rnams 'dus pa stong phrag bcu gnyis re 'byung bar grags* 'There were at least 160 Paṇḍitas in Vikramaśīla and 1000 monks who were permanent residents. As many as 5000 renunciate monks gathered there on the occasion of festivals and the like. At Vajrāsana (Bodhgayā) 40 adherents of the Mahāyāna and 200 Śrāvaka monks resided permanently, maintained by the king. From time to time as many as 10,000 Śrāvaka monks congregated there. In Uddaṇḍapura there were 1000 permanently resident monks, comprising adherents both of the Mahāyāna and of the Hīnayāna. From time to time 12,000 renunciate monks gathered there'; *HBI*, p. 313.

[195] I take this to be an image of Śākyamuni attaining enlightenment seated beneath

deities of the Mantranaya (*gsang sngags nang gi lha khang chung ngu*) and fifty-four "common" temples (*lha khang dkyus ma*), that is to say, temples enshrining exoteric, non-Tantric images. The king, we are told, provided generous allowances for the food and clothing of one hundred and eight Paṇḍitas, three Vajrācārya specialists to perform Bali offerings, rituals of image-installation, and fire-sacrifices respectively, and three officials. The first is the 'Guardian of Duties' (*bya ba bsrung pa*), perhaps an official appointed to ensure monks' adherence to the various roles assigned to them in the running of the monastery. The second is termed mysteriously 'Guardian of Doves' (*phug ron bsrung pa*), and the third is the 'Supervisor of the Monastery's Subjects' (*lha 'bangs kyi gnyer byed pa*), these being, perhaps, both the serfs or tenants that worked the monastery's estates and the servants within the monastery itself.[196] Archaeological excavations have revealed that the cell-lined square court of Vikramaśīla[197] measured 1073 feet on each side, that the entire site was spread over an area of more than one hundred acres,[198] and that Dharmapāla's monastery at Somapura (Pāhāṛpur) was of similar design and plan and of only slightly smaller size,[199] as was the monastery founded by Bhavadeva of Samataṭa at Paṭṭikera (Mainâmatī).[200] We also have some information concerning the scale of the monastery at Nālandā during the early seventh century when the Chinese scholar Xuanzang was there. According to the account written by his pupil Huili there were as many 10,000

---

the Bodhi tree, as in the case of the approximately contemporary principal image in the central shrine of Monastery 1 at Ratnagiri, though that is somewhat larger than life-sized, the figure seated in the lotus posture being over two metres in height. See HARLE 1994, p. 163; HUNTINGTON 1985, fig. 19.44. We see another example in the central shrine at Udayagiri (*IAR* 1997–98, Plate 101; 1998–99, Plate 48).

[196] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 165, l. 17–p. 166,5; *HBI*, p. 275. The three specialists are a *gtor ma'i slob dpon*, a *rab gnas slob dpon*, and a *sbyin sreg slob dpon*, i.e. a *balyācāryaḥ*, a *pratiṣṭhācāryaḥ*, and a *homācāryaḥ*.

[197] On the reasons for identifying the monastery at Antichak with the Vikramaśīla-mahāvihāra see p. 88.

[198] MITRA in *EITA*, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 403; *IAR* 1972–1973, pp. 4–5 (the western outer wall shows a length of 330 metres; p. 5 gives a plan of the excavated structures): *IAR* 1973–4, pp. 8–9 (northern wall measures 330 metres).

[199] DIKSHIT 1938, pp. 18–36. Plate I (general plan). He reports (p. 18) that the outer quadrangle measures 822 feet externally on each side (according to MITRA in *EITA*, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 403, it measures 922 by 919 feet) and (p. 34) that the original monastery was designed to accommodate some 600 to 800 monks and that in the eleventh century the number of residents can have been no more than 400. The massive central cruciform shrine-complex measures 386 by 352 feet.

[200] This monastery is probably that known as the Sālban Vihāra, consisting like the monasteries of Vikramaśīla and Somapura of a massive cruciform shrine within a square enclosure which though considerably smaller than that of those monasteries was nonetheless of great size, each side being 550 feet in length; see MITRA in *EITA*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 402–403.

monks there, all Mahāyānists, either as permanent residents or visitors, and over a 1000 learned scholars.[201]

These royal monasteries are likely to have accumulated great wealth. The tax-exempt agricultural lands granted to them at the time of their foundation would have provided them with a substantial initial endowment: Huili reports that Nālandā's was the revenue of about 100 villages;[202] and the wealth from this source would no doubt have been augmented by subsequent land-grants[203] and would certainly have been augmented by other votive donations, bequests from the estates of deceased laymen,[204] and the profits of such non-religious activities as banking and the provision of irrigation and other agricultural facilities.[205]

No doubt they would also have benefitted from the riches accumulated by individual monks in the form of the rewards (*dakṣiṇā*) that they earned by giving initiations, imparting instruction, installing images, consecrating monasteries and temples, reciting sacred texts, and performing rites for protection, funeral ceremonies, and the like.[206] Tibetan sources record the very large amounts of gold which Indian and Tibetans required for such services. 'Brog mi agreed to give the Indian Gayadhara 100 gold *srang*, some 3,750 grams, each year for five years in return for the transmission of the esoteric Lam 'bras teachings;[207] Zur po che shā kya 'byung nas offered 'Brog mi 100;[208] Rva lo tsā ba gave 100 *srang* to the Nepalese Guru Bha ro phyag rdum for the *Yamāri* cycle instructions; Se tsha bsod nams rgyal mtshan gave 50 *srang* to the Nepalese Kāyaśrī for the precepts of the *Nam mkha' skor gsum*; Mar pa performed a rite to protect the sons of some wealthy men and charged 10 gold *srang* for each son;[209] and the hagiographies of early Tibetans who travelled to India to acquire initiation and instruction abound in reports of the need to amass large quantities of gold for this purpose.[210]

It would be rash to assume that the fortunes that were garnered in this way by Indian Ācāryas were added directly to the resources of their monasteries. A passage in the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhitantra*, a text produced in the seventh century, at the beginning of the history of the Mantranaya as a fully-fledged path within the Mahāyāna,[211] suggests that this was the case:[212]

> After the [*śāntika*]*homaḥ* the Mantrin should request from the disciples a fee (*dakṣiṇā*) of gold, silver, jewels, a stallion, an elephant, a mare, a cow, a bull, a buffalo, cloth, and whatever else is fitting. At that time the disciples should give the *dakṣiṇā* to the Guru, respectfully, with faith, generating joy in their minds. Or at any rate they should make the Guru entirely satisfied. After [the Mantrin, that is to say, the Guru] has done this he should do a rite of self-protection and then exhort the excellent disciples as follows: All the Buddhas teach that this is a field for [the sowing of] merit for the benefit of all living beings. Therefore give to the Saṅgha, [for it is] vast in its pure virtues.

But it is striking that references to the Saṅgha are not found in this context in later texts, which only specify the goods that should be given.These are much the same as in the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, though Dīpaṅkarabhadra, setting out the procedure for initiation with the Maṇḍala of the *Guhyasamāja*, adds land at the head of the list,[213] and the scripture *Laghuśaṃvaratantra* goes so far as include a *rāṣṭram*, which I take to mean [the revenues of] 'a district' or 'sub-district' of a kingdom and therefore to be envisaging the gift of a monarch.[214] Moreover, the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*, which was the predominant code of monastic law in eastern India and was thence adopted in Tibet, recognizes that monks had private property and that there could be great differences of wealth owned by individuals within the Saṅgha. However, it also insists that such property does not go to the king when a monk dies, as brahmanical law required in the case of those who die without offspring, but remains within the monastic community to which he belongs.[215] Of course, a wealthy Guru could also donate his wealth to

---

[201] BEAL 1914, p. 112.

[202] BEAL 1914, p. 112.

[203] We have a record (*EI* 17:17: the Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāla) of one such subsequent land-grant in the case of the monastery at Nālandā. This records that in the 35th year of Devapāla, *c.* 847, five villages were assigned for the support of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha of a new monastery (*vihāraḥ*) constructed at this site by Mahāraja Bālaputradeva, the Śailendra king of Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra). That the regnal year is the 35th is the view of SIRCAR (1983, p. 79, note 38). Hirananda SHASTRI read the numerals as 39 (*EI* 17:17, l. 42).

[204] The *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* speaks of the validity of written wills in which wealthy laymen transfer their entire estate to the the Saṅgha; see *Gilgit Manuscripts* vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 140, l. 14–15, l. 1; and SCHOPEN 2004, p. 6. It also sets out rules obliging monks to accept permanent endowments of cash (*akṣayanīvī*) (SCHOPEN, *loc. cit.*).

[205] On the profit-making activities of Buddhist monasteries in the fifth and sixth centuries in India and in China under the Northern Wei (386–534) see LIU 1994, pp. 120–158. As for banking, the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* requires the funds of permanent endowments (*akṣayanīvī*) for the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha to be lent out on interest (*vṛddhiḥ*) (SCHOPEN 2004, pp. 6–7, 47–49, 53). On monastic landlordism and the profitable management of irrigation works, in which local farmers were given access to such facilities in return for a share of their crops as a donation to the Saṅgha see SHAW and SUTCLIFFE 2003 and GUNAWARDANA 1979.

[206] For the *dakṣiṇā* for the Tantric funeral ceremony see here p. 102.

[207] *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 90, *Blue Annals*, p. 207

[208] *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 92

[209] *Blue Annals*, pp. 377, 395, and 400.

[210] See, for example, pp. 399–401 of the account of the life of Mar pa in the *Blue Annals*.

[211] The earliest certain evidence of the text is its Chinese translation by Śubhākarasiṃha and Yijing registered in A.D. 725 (Taishō 848). But HODGE (2003, pp. 14–15) points out that Yijing's *Xiyuqiufaguosengzhuan* ('Record of Eminent Monks who Sought the Dharma in the West') reports that the monk Wuxing, his contemporary in India, had died as he was setting out to return to China in 674, that texts he had collected were forwarded to China, and that three important Tantras are listed among these works: the *Subāhuparipṛcchā*, the *Susiddhikara*, and the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*.

[212] *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud*, f. 173r4–7: *sbyin sreg rjes la sngags pa yis | slob ma rnams la yon bslang ba | gser dang dngul dang rin chen dang | rta dang de bzhin glang po dang | rta mo ba lang ma he gos | gzhan yang dngos po ci yang rung | de tshe slob mas gus par ni | dad pa rab tu ldan pa yis | sems la dga' ba bskyed nas su | bla ma ni yon bdul lo | yang na ci nas bla ma de | rab tu mgu bar 'gyur bar bya | de ltar byas nas bdag bsrung ste | slob ma de pos bsgo ba ni | 'di ni bsod nams zhing yin zhes | sems can kun gyi don gyi phyir | skyob pa rnams ni kun gyis gsungs | rnam dag yon tan rgyas pa yi | dge 'dun la ni kun gyis byin.*

the monasteries during his lifetime by creating religious endowments. We have a striking example of this in the eleventh century. Rva Lo tsā ba, who had become extremely wealthy by charging for instruction in the Tantras—he is said to have established fixed rates for a wide range of texts—, sent 100 *srangs* of gold to Vikramaśīla to fund the recitation in perpetuity of a copy of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* written in gold, two golden copies of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, and 100 *srangs* of gold to fund the recitation in perpetuity of eighty-four copies of the *Prajñāpāramitāsaṃcayagāthā* by eighty-four Paṇḍitas of the monastery.[216]

How closely the Pāla emperors and their bureaucracy were involved in the supervision of their Buddhist foundations cannot be determined from the available evidence. But it is almost certain that a Superintendent would have been appointed by the ruler to oversee their administration and that he would have required a substantial staff to enable him to do so. The *Ratnāvalī*, a Mahāyānist work of uncertain authorship written before the sixth century,[217] advises the unknown king to whom it is addressed on the proper administration of his realm and begins by declaring: "Appoint for all religious foundations a Superintendent of Religion (*dharmādhikṛtaḥ*) who is energetic, without avarice, learned, and virtuous, who will not oppress them".[218] It goes on to advise him on the qualities he should look for in those whom he appoints as ministers (*sacivāḥ*), military commanders (*daṇḍanāyakāḥ*), and superintendents (*adhikṛtāḥ*), telling the king: "Have them submit to you complete monthly accounts of revenues and outgoings and, after hearing these, personally conduct all business pertaining to religious foundations and the rest".[219] This, of course, is not evidence of what was done in the Pāla realm. But as I read the passage it is the qualities and duties of these various officials that are the subject of injunction, not their existence; and there is certainly nothing exceptional in the office itself, since we have evidence that it was normal in kingdoms throughout the Indic world.[220] Ab-

---

[213] *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*, f. 16v1–2, v. 375c: *bhūgajādisuvarṇādau* 'land, an elephant or [other mount], gold, and other [valuables]'. The *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* of Śūnyasamādhivajra includes houses, land, and male and female slaves among the gifts that should be given to an officiant who performs the Tantric funerary ceremony (*antyeṣṭiḥ*): *yojanako 'pi svavibhavānurūpaṃ vastrālaṃkāraśayanāsanagṛhakṣetradāsīdāsādikaṃ dakṣiṇām ācāryāya sādaraṃ dadyāt* (f. 4r2–3).

[214] *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 4r1–3 (3.11–14b): *tatas tu gurave dadyāt tathāgatoktadakṣiṇām | nirjātyaṃ suvarṇaśatasahasraṃ ratnāni vividhāni ca* || 3.12 *vastrayugmaśataṃ caiva gaja vājī rāṣṭram eva ca | karṇābharaṇa kaṭakaṃ ca kaṇṭhikāṅgulikaiś ca samuttamam* || 3.13 *yajñopavīta sauvarṇaṃ svabhāryāṃ duhitām api | dāsa dāsī bhagnīṃ vāpi praṇipatya nivedayet* 'Then he should give to the Guru the *dakṣiṇā* prescribed by the Tathāgata. After prostrating himself he should give 100,000 [Palas] of the most precious gold, jewels of various kinds, 200 lengths of cloth, an elephant, a horse, and a *rāṣṭram*, earrings, bracelets, necklaces, rings, and a crown, a golden caste-thread, his wife, his daughter, a male slave, a female slave, or his sister'. The use of the term *rāṣṭram* for 'a district' or 'sub-district' is seen in inscriptions; see SIRCAR 1966, pp. 277–278. My translation of the passage follows the text and interpretation of the commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa. The reading *nirjātyaṃ*, which he interprets as 'most precious', is suspect. The MS (*Laghuśaṃvara*, f. 4r2) reads the much more satisfactory *niryātya* 'having given', as does the commentator Kambalapāda (*Sādhananidhi*, f. 11v4); and this is also the reading seen in f. 54v3–5 of the *Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya of Ratnagiri in Orissa (see here p. 91), in the Nepalese *codex unicus* of 1056. See also *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* f. 60v1–2 (4.1.46–47), which includes a house, land with rights to mine, and grain: *tato gurudakṣinaṃ dadyā śiṣya bhāvena nityaśaḥ | ātmapatnīṃ saputraṃ vā bāndhavaiḥ saha ceṭikaiḥ | hasti aśva gavādīnāṃ gṛha kṣetraś ca gotravān || sauvarṇa rajata tāmraṃ vastrādi vrīhidhānyakaiḥ*. The *Vimalaprabhā* on *Kālacakratantra*, *Abhiṣekapaṭala* v. 198 explains that verse as meaning that the initiate should promise always to give to his Guru one sixth of all his inherited and self-acquired wealth in the form of gold, jewels, grains and the like, and a sixth of all his livestock. It adds that he is required to give his wife to the Guru five times each month (vol. 2, p. 144, ll. 17–22).

[215] The inheritance of the property of deceased monks is treated in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* in the *Cīvaravastu* (*Gilgit Manuscripts* vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 113–148). Particularly relevant in this context is its discussion of the case of the monk Upananda, who died leaving 300,000 in gold (pp. 117–121). King Prasenajit is persuaded that the estate does not belong to the crown and the Buddha rules that it should be distributed among the monks of his monastery: *bhājayata yūyaṃ bhikṣava upanandasya bhikṣor mṛtapariṣkāram* (p. 119, ll. 13–14). The main concern here is to ensure that the wealth of monks stays within the community, free of the state's interferecee. For analysis of the treatment of these and related matters in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* see SCHOPEN 2004, pp. 3–6. The private property of a deceased monk was to be divided, directly or after sale, among the members of his community or, where this was not appropriate, as in the case of land, servants, and grain-stores, taken over for the use of the whole community (*Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 141, l. 4–143, l. 1). But when the estate contained precious metals, worked or not, those were to be divided into three shares, one for each of the Three Jewels (*Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 143, ll. 10–12: *suvarnaṃ ca hiraṇyaṃ ca yac cānyac ca kṛtākṛtaṃ trayo bhāgāḥ kartavyāḥ | eko buddhasya | eko dharmasya tṛtīyaḥ saṅghasya*). That for the Buddha should be used for repairs to the monastery's Buddha shrine (*gandhakuṭī*) and relic Stūpas, that for the Dharma should fund the copying or enthroning of the Buddha's teachings, and that for the Saṅgha should be divided among the monks (*ibid.*, ll. 12–14). In the case of jewels other than pearls half should go to the Dharma and half to the Saṅgha (*ibid.*, ll. 1–5). Manuscripts of Buddhist texts should be added to the monastery's library and manuscripts of non-Buddhist texts should be sold and the proceeds shared (*ibid.*, ll. 5–7).

[216] *Blue Annals*, p. 377.

[217] The work is attributed to the Nāgārjuna of *Mūlāmadhyamakakārikā* fame. I consider this attribution to be doubtful in spite the fact that it is made by such authors of the sixth century and later as Bhāvaviveka, Candrakīrti, Haribhadra, Kamalaśīla, and *Ajitamitra (Mi pham bshes gnyen), who wrote the only known commentary on the text, which has come down to us in a Tibetan translation made by the Bande Dpal brtsegs with the Indian Vidyākaraprabha in the early ninth century. The *Ratnāvalī* itself contains no evidence of its authorship and VETTER (1992) has cast doubt on the traditional attribution through an analysis of its metre and word frequency.

---

[218] *Ratnāvalī* 4.22: *sarvadharmādhikāreṣu dharmādhikṛtam utthitam | alubdhaṃ paṇḍitaṃ dharmyaṃ kuru teṣām abādhakam*. The term *dharmādhikāraḥ*, which elsewhere is used to refer to the office of the Superintendent, is clearly used here in the meaning 'religious foundation', as the Tibetan translation *chos kyi gzhi* agrees, and as it occurrence earlier in the same passage (4.18) confirms: *dharmādhikārā ye cānye pūrvarājapravartitāḥ | devadroṇyādayas te 'pi pravartyantāṃ yathā sthitāḥ* 'And you should ensure that temples and other religious foundations created by former kings should continue as they are'. This sense of the word is also found in Licchavi inscriptions; see *LKA* 71, ll. 12; and 81, l. 11–12: *bhaviṣyadbhir api bhūpatibhiḥ pūrvarājakṛtadharmādhikārapālanādṛtair bhavitavyam* 'Future kings too must take care to maintain religious foundations created by kings of the past'.

[219] *Ratnāvalī* 4.26: *pratimāsaṃ ca tebhyas tvaṃ sarvam āyavyayaṃ śṛṇu | śrutvā *dharmādhikārādyaṃ kāryaṃ sarvaṃ* (Tib. *chos gzhi sogs kyi don kun nyid*) *svayaṃ kuru*.

[220] In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* of Kālidāsa Duṣyanta, wishing to conceal his identity from Śakuntalā tells us that he has been appointed by the king to the office of Superintendent of Religion and accordingly has come to her hermitage in his official capacity to satisfy himself that they are free of hindrances to the performance of their rites; Act 1, after v. 22, p. 38: *bhavati yaḥ pauraveṇa rājñā dharmādhikāre niyuktaḥ so 'ham avighnakriyopalambhāya dharmāraṇyam āyātaḥ*. The fifth Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription, of 533/4, recording a formal request for the purchase of land in the Koṭivarṣa district to be given to a nearby temple, speaks of it being presented with the full knowledge of the Office of Religion (*dharmādhikārabuddhyā*) (*EI* 15:7, p. 143). A banker Ralhaṇa has the title *dharmakarmādhikārī* 'the superintendent of religious activities' in the Kharod inscription dated in 1181/2 of Ratnadeva III, the Kalacuri of Ratnapura (*EI* 21:26, l. 28: *śreṣṭhinā ralhaṇenātra dharmakarmādhikāriṇā*). The humourous play *Āgamaḍambara*, composed by the Kashmirian philosopher Jayantabhaṭṭa and set in the Kashmir of his own time, during the reign of Śaṅkaravarman (883–902), has a Śaiva ascetic inform us that a brahmin Saṃkarṣaṇa has been appointed by that king to the *dharmarakṣādhikāraḥ*, the 'Office of Superintendent of Religion' for the whole country (Act 3, Prelude, p. 132: *śakalāe yyeva vaśuṃdhalāe dhammalaṣkādhiāle ṇiutte* [*sakalāyā eva vasuṃdharāyā dharmarakṣādhikāre niyuktaḥ]). The term *dharmādhikṛtaḥ* occurs in a fifteenth-century inscription from Nīlācala, the site of the famous temple

sence of thorough external control of the great monasteries seems all the more unlikely when one considers that apart from the fact that they were such large and wealthy establishments it was not the case that by building, equipping, and endowing a monastery a patron surrendered his ownership entirely. The patron continued to be the owner of the monastery and its contents (*mahāvihārasvāmī*, *vihārasvāmī*) in some sense and the monks were obliged to employ all these for the purposes for which they were designated, the return for the owner being the constantly augmenting merit that was generated for him by their repeated use (*paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyam*). Only where there was no such use, as in the case of a Caitya, did a donor gain merit once and for all by the simple act of surrendering ownership (*tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam*).[221]

Moreover, we know that monks who held senior teaching positions in the great monasteries did so by royal appointment,[222] and that rituals for state pro-

---

of Kāmākhyā, near Gauhati in Assam, recording a grant of land by a king Mādhava. The inscription opens with the information that the grant has the approval of this official: *dharmādhikṛtenānumatam* (SIRCAR 1979, p. 16. l. 1). Mpu Prapañca reveals in his Old Javanese poem *Deśawarṇana* that there were two Superintendents of Religion in the Majapahit kingdom of east Java, one for the Buddhists (*dharmādhyakṣa kasogatan*), and the other for the Śaivas (*dharmādhyakṣa kashaiwan*). Inscriptions from that kingdom reveal that there was also a board of subordinate religious officials known as the Assessors of Religion (*dharmopapatti* or *dharmādhikaraṇa*); see SANTIKO 1995, p. 56; cf. here p.119; for references see ZOETMULDER 1982, under *dharmādhyakṣa*, *dharmopapatti* and *dharmādhikaraṇa*.

[221] On this crucial distinction between *paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyam* and *tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam* see Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on 4.121a (*caitye tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam* 'In the case of a Caitya there is merit that accrues from surrender'): *caitye sarāgasyātmārthaṃ dānam ity uktam | tatrāsaty upabhoktari kathaṃ puṇyaṃ bhavati | dvividhaṃ puṇyaṃ tyāgānvayaṃ tyāgād eva yad utpadyate paribhogānvayaṃ ca deyadharmaparibhogād yad utpadyate | caitye tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam* (4.121a) 'It has been said that a gift to a Caitya made by one who is not free of attachment is for his own benefit. Since there is no enjoyer of the gift in such cases how can there be merit [generated by such a gift]? Merit is of two kinds: *tyāgānvayam*, which arises only from the surrender [of ownership of what is given], and *paribhogānvayam*, which arises from the enjoyment of a pious gift [by the recipients]'. One should note that the restrictive particle *eva* is used here only after *tyāgād*. Vasubandhu does not state conversely in the case of *paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyam* that this kind of merit arises only (*eva*) from the use of the donation. I infer that merit in such cases was understood to arise both from the act of surrendering possession and from subsequent use. This is confirmed by Candrakīrti, who in his *Prasannapadā*, commenting on *paribhogānvayam* in *Madhyamakakārikā* 17.5a, speaks of the goods used as 'surrendered' (*parityaktasya*). See *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on 4.4ab addressing the conundrum of how the Buddha's doctrine of moral action as intention (*cetanā*) can be reconciled with this claim of the accretion of further merit (*puṇyavṛddhiḥ*) whenever a recipient uses something donated whether or not the donor is aware of it; and SANDERSON 1995c, pp. 38–40.

[222] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 179, ll. 13–14: *rgyal pos spyan drangs te nā la ndā dang | bi kra ma la shī la'i nub sgo bar bskos shin* 'The king invited [Vāgīśvarakīrti]

tection were performed on behalf of the monarch at Vikramaśila. We have seen above Tāranātha's report of the fire-ritual performed for the benefit of the dynasty by the Vajrācāryas of that monastery; and two important texts on the ritual of initiation written by two major Tantric authorities under the early Pālas, the *Sarvavajrodaya* of Ānandagarbha and the *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṅkarabhadra, the successor of Buddhajñāna at Vikramaśīla, insert ancillary rites specifically for the averting of danger from the monarch.[223] Moreover,

---

to Nālandā and made him the Guardian of the Western Gate of Vikramaśīla'; p. 182, l. 10: *bdus kyi ka chen dang po bram ze rin chen rdo rje ni* 'The brahmin Ratnavajra, the first [occupant of the the position of the] Great Central Pillar of Vikramaśīla'; p. 182, l. 19: *rgyal pos bi kra ma shī la'i *pa* (corr. : *sa* Ed.) *tra phul* 'The king bestowed [on Ratnavajra] the charter of appointment [as the chief monk] of Vikramaśīla' *HBI*, p. 297 and 301. We may presume that the same applied to those who held office as the Gate Guardians of the other three directions (*Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 181, ll. 8–10): and to Jñānaśrīmitra, described as the second to hold office at Vikramaśīla as the Great Central Pillar (p. 183, l. 11). King Bheyapāla (Abhayapāla?), a king otherwise unknown, whom Tāranātha makes the predecessor of Neyapāla (Nayapāla [r.c. 1027-1043], the successor of Mahīpāla I), is reported to have bestowed charters of appointment on only seventy Paṇḍitas of Vikramaśīla (*Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 184, ll. 14: *bi kra ma shī lar ni | pa ṇḍi ta bdun cu tsam gyi *pa tra* (corr. : *sa tra* Ed.) *las ma tshugs te*; *HBI*, p. 304) Tāranātha tells us that for that reason he is not counted among the Seven Pālas (p. 184, ll. 14–15, *HBI*, p. 304), that is to say the seven remembered for their exceptional patronage of the faith. These seven are not listed, but Tāranātha does say which of the Pālas were excluded from the list. The seven that remain are Gopāla, Devapāla, Dharmapāla, Mahīpāla, Mahāpāla, Neyapāla (Nayapāla), and Rāmapāla. Other, later appointments recorded by Tāranātha are those of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna as Upādhyāya at Vikramaśīla under Bheyapāla, with responsibility also for Uddaṇḍapura (p. 304), the Prāmāṇika Yamāri under Nayapāla (p. 187, l. 19: *bi kra ma shī lar *pa tra* (corr. : *sa tra* Ed.) *cher thob* 'He obtained the great charter of Vikramaśīla'; *HBI*, p. 308), and Abhayākaragupta as Upādhyāya, first at Vajrāsana and then at Vikramaśīla and Nālandā, under Rāmapāla (p. 189, l. 10–13; *HBI*, p. 313). I take the term *patra* here (=*patram*, *patrikā*) to mean an official document bestowing an office and hence by extension office or authority bestowed by this means; cf. *patrikā* in *Tantrālokaviveka*, vol. 3, p. 191, ll. 3–6, the commentary of the Kashmirian *Mahānayaprakāśa* p. 115,8, and *Vāmakeśvarīmatavivaraṇa*, p. 55 (on the theft of such documents by fraudulent Gurus); also the expressions *tāmrapatram* and *śāsanapatram* for a royal charter. With the names of Indian Buddhist authors and translators we commonly encounter the title Mahāpaṇḍita (Mkhas pa chen po / Paṇ chen) (also Mahāpaṇḍitasthavira, Mahāpaṇḍitācārya, and Mahāpaṇḍitabhikṣu). Among Tantric scholars with this title are Atulyavajra, Advayavajra, Abhayākaragupta, Ānandagarbha, Kuladatta, Darpaṇācārya, Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, Durjayacandra, Nāropā, Buddhaguhya, Bhavabhaṭṭa, Ratnarakṣita, Ratnākaraśānti, Raviśrījñāna, Vāgīśvarakīrti, Vibhūticandra, Śākyarakṣita, and Śrīdhara. It is perhaps analogous to the Chinese Buddhist title *dashi* (Jap. *daishi*) 'Great Master', which came to be bestowed by the Emperor on distinguished monks from the reign of Yizong (859–873) onwards; see FORTE 1994, pp. 1023–1034.

[223] Ānandagarbha, *Sarvavajrodaya* f. 29r1–2 (a preliminary rite): **mānuṣāsthicūrṇa-*

Tāranātha relates several occasions on which Buddhist Tantric masters were believed to have used Tantric rituals to good effect against the enemies of their patrons in times of danger.[224] In some sense, then, these were state monasteries, not unlike the great imperial monasteries of Tang China and Japan,[225] rather

---

homenāsṛgviṣasahitena (em. [Tib., cited in Ed. *mi rus kyi bye ma khrag dang dug dang bcas pa dang*] : *mānuṣāsthicūrṇaho + + + + viṣasahitena* Cod., Ed.) *maṇḍalavighnaṃ nivāryātmaśiṣyabhūpālādiśāntikahomaṃ kuryāt* 'After having removed [all] impeding spirits from the Maṇḍala by offering into the fire powder of human bone mixed with blood and poison he should perform a fire-sacrifice for the warding off of dangers from himself, the candidate(s) for initiation, and the monarch or other [ruler]'; and Dīpaṅkarabhadra, *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* f. 16v1, vv. 373–374 (a concluding rite): *saty eva saṃbhave teṣāṃ pratyekaṃ vāmapāṇinā | sarvāṅguṣṭhakam āgṛhya śāntiṃ kuryād vidhānataḥ || trisaptāhutim ekām vā rājño vā bhūpater atha | dikpālasvātmaśāntau ca hutvā yāceta dakṣiṇāṃ* 'With his left hand he should take hold of the right thumb [of the person who has been initiated] and make offerings into the sacrificial fire in accordance with the prescribed procedure, doing this for each [of the initiates in turn], if that is possible. Having made twenty-one oblations or just one to ward off danger from [each of these and, then from] the monarch or [lesser] ruler, also from [the Vajrācāryas who have officiated as] the Guardians of the Directions and himself, he should request his fee'. The rite of offering at this point a *śāntikahomaḥ* of twenty-one oblations for each of the candidates while holding their right thumbs with the left hand is derived from *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhitantra*, but the extension of that rite in order to protect the king, the Guardians of the Directions, and the main officiant himself is an innovation not found there; f. 172v5–6 . . . 173r3–4: *slob ma sdig dang bral ba kun | de ltar legs par btsud nas ni | de dag zhi bar bya ba'i phyir sbyin sreg cho ga bzhin du bya . . . de nas slob ma re re nas | mkhas pas lag pa g.yon pa yis | g.yas pa'i mtho bong bzung nas su | mnyam par bzhag pas sbyin sreg bya | yid ni mnyam par bzhag nas su | sreg blugs re re las kyang ni | gsang sngags cho ga bzhin zlos shing | nyi shu rtsa gcig sbyin sreg bya | na maḥ sa ma nta bu ddhā nāṃ | oṃ ma hā shā *nti* (em. : *nta* Cod.) *ga ta shā nti ka ra pra sha ma dha rmma ni rjā ta a bhā ba sva bhā ba dha rmma sa ma tā prā pte svā hā | sbyin sreg rjes la sngags pa yis | slob ma rnams la yon bslang ba* 'When he has in this way introduced all the sin-free disciples [before the Maṇḍala] he should duly perform a fire-offering to ward of danger from them. . . . Then the learned [officiant], should concentrate himself and make offerings into the fire, after grasping the right thumb of each disciple with his left hand. With his mind concentrated he should offer twenty-one oblations for each, reciting according to the Mantra rite NAMAḤ SAMANTABUDDHĀNĀM | OṂ MAHĀŚĀNTIGATA ŚĀNTIKARA PRAŚAMADHARMANIRJĀTA ABHĀVASVABHĀVADHARMASAMATĀPRĀPTE SVĀHĀ. After the fire-offering the Mantrin should request his fee from the disciples'.

[224] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 178, ll. 4–7; *HBI*, p. 294 (the Balyācārya of Vikramaśīla destroys a Turuṣka army invading from Bengal); p. 186, ll. 8–11, *HBI*, p. 306 (Prajñārakṣita makes offerings to Cakrasaṃvara when Vikramaśīla monastery is attacked by a Turuṣka army: the army is struck by lightning, which killed their leader and many others, so that they were repelled); p. 197, 1–4, *HBI*, pp. 326–7 (Līlāvajra, Tantrācārya of Vikramaśīla, defeats the Turuṣkas by drawing the Yamāricakra); and p. 197, l. 22–p. 198, l. 9; *HBI* p. 328 (Kamalarakṣita drives off a Turuṣka army from Vikramaśīla by throwing enchanted water at them during a Tantric feast [*gaṇacakram*]).

[225] On the imperial Great Monasteries of China and Japan (Ch. *ta si*, Jpn. *daiji* [Skt.

than autonomous, self-governing institutions.

The Pālas' Engagement with Śaivism

The Pālas were certainly the most liberal patrons of Buddhist institutions in early medieval India, and it was no doubt largely because of this that the religion was able to develop and flourish so remarkably in their realm. However, it should not be thought that the scale of these rulers' support implies that they at least, unlike the other royal patrons of Buddhism that have been reviewed here, must have turned their backs on Śaivism, starving it of patronage that it might otherwise have received. For there is much evidence to the contrary.

In the ninth century Devapāla is praised in a charter of his son Mahendrapāla for having built two temples of outstanding beauty during his rule, one for the Buddha and the other for the consort of Śiva;[226] and Mahendrapāla is reported to have established a temple for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā/Cāmuṇḍā).[227] An eleventh-century Praśasti from Bāṇgarh, ancient Koṭivarṣa in Varendrī, also called Devīkoṭa and Śoṇitapura, informs us that Nayapāla had the Saiddhāntika Sarvaśiva as his royal preceptor (*gauḍarājaguruḥ*), and that when Sarvaśiva retired he passed this office to his brother Mūrtiśiva. This implies that Nayapāla received Śaiva initiation, since to initiate the king is fundamental to the Śaiva Rājaguru's role. It also tells us that at the site of this inscription Mahīpāla I, Nayapāla's predecessor, had bestowed a Kailāsa-like monastery on Sarvaśiva's predecessor Indraśiva. Mahīpāla is described here as a 'knower of reality' (*tattvavit*), which suggests in this Śaiva context that he too had received Śaiva initiation, which suggests in turn that the gift of the monastery was his Guru's *dakṣiṇā*. It is probable, therefore, that Indraśiva too, like his successors Sarvaśiva and Mūrtiśiva, had held the office of royal preceptor.[228] I know of no direct evidence that Mahīpāla's successor Vigrahapāla III had a Saiddhāntika Rājaguru, but it is likely that he did, since in his Āṃgāchi copper-plate inscription he is described as 'devoted to Śiva's worship',[229] and there is evidence which strongly suggests that this tradition was still in place under his successor Rāmapāla. For in the twelfth century the South-Indian Saiddhantika Trilocanaśiva tells us that his preceptorial line descends from a Dharmaśambhu (Dharmaśiva) who had held office as the royal preceptor of "the king of Gauḍa", a standard expression for the Pāla rulers.[230] Since three preceptorial generations intervene in that account between Dharmaśambhu and Trilocanaśiva, it is probable that this king was Rāmapāla.[231]

---

mahāvihāraḥ]) see FORTE and DURT 1984. For Japanese Tantric Buddhist rituals of state protection (*chingokokka*) see MAY 1967.

[226] *EI* 42:2, ll. 12–13: *yo nirmame *sugatasadma gṛhaṃ ca* (corr.: *sugatasadmagṛhañ* ca Ed.) *gauryā yat kautukaṃ ca tilakaṃ ca jagattraye 'pi.*

[227] *EI* 39:7, the Siyān stone slab inscription of Nayapāla, v. 40: *mahe[ndra]pālacarcāyā mahendrasadṛśodayaḥ | yaḥ śailīṃ vaḍabhīṃ śaile sopānena sahākarot* 'who, equal in greatness to Mahendra (Viṣṇu), built for Mahendrapāla's Carcā a stone Vaḍabhī temple on [her] hill and a flight of steps [leading to it]'. When D.C. SIRCAR published this inscription he judged that it is probable that the Mahendrapāla mentioned in this verse is the Gūrjara-Pratīhāra king of that name (*EI* 39:7, p. 48), who ruled c. 885–908. In the light of the discovery of Mahendrapāla's Māldā inscription (*EI* 42:2) we may now safely assume that he was the Pāla of that name. On this goddess see here p. 231. Carcikā, Cāmuṇḍā, Carmamuṇḍā, and Karṇamoṭī are listed as synonymous deity-names in *Amarakośa* 1.1.46. The name Carcikā appears in place of Cāmuṇḍā in the *Picumata* in treatments of the eight Mothers (the seven ending with Carcikā [Māheśvarī, Brahmāṇī, Vaiṣṇavī, Kaumārī, Vaivasvatī, Māhendrī, Carcikā], with Paramā/Pūraṇī/Aghoreśī making up the total).

[228] The Bāṇgarh Praśasti of Mūrtiśiva (SIRCAR 1983b), found at Śivavāṭī (mod. Śibbāḍī) in the vicinity of Koṭivarṣa, ll. 8–9: 9 *śrīmān indraśivaḥ sphuṭaṃ hariharaprāyāṃ śivendrākṛtiṃ bibhrad vaṃśavibhūṣaṇaṃ samabhavac chiṣyo 'sya puṇyātmanaḥ | yasmai kāñcanapuñjamañjuracitaprāsādameruspphuratkailāsābhamaṭhaṃ dadāv iha mahīpālo nṛpas tattvavit*; ll. 11–12, reporting that Indraśiva's successor Sarvaśiva was the royal preceptor of Nayapāla: *rājño śrīnayapālasya gurus tattvavidāṃ varaḥ | śrīmān sarvaśivas tasya śiṣyo 'bhūd bhūṣaṇam bhuvaḥ*; and ll. 13–14, reporting that Sarvaśiva resigned his office as the Gauḍarājaguru in favour of his brother Mūrtiśiva: 14 *yenāvarjitagauḍarājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhrātari śrīmān mūrtiśive niveśya vipināvāsaṃ svayam vāñchatā | kṣīrodārṇavavamanthanotthitamilallakṣmīṃ svaśiṣye harāv āropyāharato viṣaṃ paśupater vṛttāntam udghāṭitam.*

[229] *EI* 15:18, ll. 17–19 (v. 12): *pīta<ḥ> sajjanalocanaiḥ smararipoḥ pūjānuraktaḥ sadā saṃgrāme caturo 'dhikaś ca haritaḥ kālaḥ kule vidviṣām | cāturvarṇyasamāśrayaḥ sitayaśaḥpuñjair jagad rañjayan śrīmadvigrahapāladevanṛpatir jajñe tato dhāmabhṛt* 'From [Nayapāla] was born the illustrious king Vigrahapāladeva, who was drunk by the eyes of the virtuous, ever devoted to the worship of Śiva, more skilled in battle than Indra, the god of Death to the families of his foes, support of the four caste-classes, white-washing the world with the multitudes of his stuccoed temples'.

[230] See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): *śrīgauḍeśvarapalapālapādānām* (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahīpāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: *gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.*

[231] Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva's *Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā* (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4, pp. 422–427 [B]): 1 *śrīcedirājabhuvi *śaivajanākarākhyaśrīgolakīyamaṭhabhāvaśivaś ca yo 'sau* (*śaivajanākarākhya* T2 B : *śaivajanākarākhyaś* T2 • *śrīgolakīyamaṭha* conj. : *śrīkoḷakīvimala* T1 T2 : *śrīgolakīvimala* B • *bhāvaśivaś ca yo 'sau* conj. : *bhāvaśivāśayosau* T1 T2 B) | *tadvaṃśajaḥ śivamatāgamalakṣavettā śrīdharmaśambhur iti gauḍapatīndranāthaḥ* || 2 *tasmād asāv analaśaṅkaradeśiko 'bhūd divyāgamāmbunidhir *īhitakalpavṛkṣaḥ* (T1 : *itikalpavṛkṣaḥ* B) | *svargaukasām api padaṃ vacasā labhante *yasyaiva* (conj. B : *yasyaika* T1 T2) *janmamaraṇaika*bhayān* (T2 : *bhayaṃ* T1) *nirastāḥ* || 3 **śrīgolakīyasaṃtānavyomavyāpī* (*golakīya* T2 B : *koḷakīya* T1) *tataḥ śivaḥ | śrīsomaśambhur ity āsīt kalau lokahitāya vai* || 4 *jñānaśaktivapus tasmāj jñānaśambhuḥ sadāśivaḥ | yenedaṃ dyotitaṃ sarvaṃ śaivajñānāmalārciṣā* || 5 *somārkavaṃśanṛpamauli*vilolitāṅghrir* (T2 B : *vilolitāṅghri* T1) *vidvajjanānanasarojadivākaro mām*

There is other evidence of these kings' engagement with Śaivism. The poet Saṃdhyākaranandin describes king Madanapāla, Rāmapāla's second son, as a devotee of Śiva;[232] and a pedestal inscription of 1026 recording renovations of Buddhist structures at Sārnāth by two Pāla princes Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, also tells us that Mahīpāla I had engaged them to have hundreds of temples of Śiva, Citraghaṇṭā, and other deities built in Benares and that he did so after offering obeisance at the feet of the Guru Vāmarāśi of that city, who, as we can infer from his name in -rāśi, was a Śaiva ascetic of the Atimārga.[233]

| *dīnāndhasūrikṛpaṇātithi*pārijātaḥ* (corr.:*pārijāta* T2B:*vārajāta* T1) *śrījñāna-śambhur aniśaṃ malinaṃ punātu* '[1] In the land of the king of Cedi [lived] Dharmaśambhu, a spiritual descendant in the lineage of the famous Bhāvaśiva [=Sadbhāvaśiva/Prabhāvaśiva, founder] of the venerable monastery at Golakī. He mastered one hundred thousand [verses] of the scriptures of the religion of Śiva and became the Lord [Guru] of the King of Gauḍa. [2] His successor was the famous teacher Analaśiva, an ocean of the celestial scriptures, a tree of paradise that granted every wish, one through whose instruction men attained the world of the gods, free of the unique terror of birth and death. [3] His successor was Somaśambhu, a Śiva who for the good of mankind [was the sun whose light] filled the sky of the venerable lineage of Golakī. [4] His successor in [this] Kali age was Jñānaśambhu, the very embodiment of [Śiva's] power of knowledge, [a] Sadāśiva who illuminated this universe with the pure radiance of his understanding of Śiva's teachings'. [5] His feet were caressed by the crowns of kings of the lineages of both the moon and the sun. He was a sun to the lotuses that are the faces of the learned. He was the tree of paradise to the needy, to the blind, to scholars, to the wretched, and to uninvited guests. May Jñānaśambhu ever [continue to] cleanse me [as his disciple], impure as I am'. The king of Cedi referred to at the beginning of this passage is the Kalacuri and his land is Ḍāhaladeśa, the region of central India approximately comprising within modern Madhya Pradesh the Jabalpur District, and parts of the Satna, Panna, and Rewa Districts.

[232] *Rāmacarita* 4.35b: *śivapraṇayī*.

[233] The Sārnāth inscription of Mahīpāla (HULTZSCH 1885): *oṃ namo buddhāya* | **vārāṇasīsarasyāṃ* (corr.:*vārāṇaśīsarasyāṃ* Ep.) *guravaśrīvāmarāśipādābjam* | *ārādhya namitabhūpatiśiroruhaiḥ śaival*ādhīśam* (?) || *īśānacitraghaṇṭādikīrtiratna-śatāni yau* | *gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ kāśyāṃ śrīmān akāra[yat]* || *saphalīkṛtapāṇḍityau bodhāv avinivartinau* | *tau dharmmarājikāṃ sāṅgaṃ dharmmacakraṃ punar nnavam* || *kṛtavantau ca navīnām aṣṭamahāsthānaśailagandhakuṭīm* | *etāṃ śrīsthirapālo vasantapālo 'nujaḥ śrīmān* 'Obeisance to the Buddha. Sthirapāla and his younger brother Vasantapāla, whom the Glorious Mahīpāla, the ruler of Gauḍa, caused to erect hundreds of fine temples for Śiva, Citraghaṇṭā, and [other] gods in Kāśī after worshipping the venerable Gurava Vāmarāśi's feet, the lotuses that beautify the lake that is Vārāṇasī, with [strands of] duckweed *clinging to them (?) in the form of the hair of the kings that bow down to them, have made the Dharmarājikā, a new Dharmacakra together with its ancillaries, and a new Buddha-shrine from stones of the eight sacred places, having made their learning bear fruit, refusing to turn back in their quest for enlightenment'. The reading *śaivalādhīśam* is surely a mistake, for if it were sound it could only yield the absurd meaning 'overlord of duckweed'. The meaning required by the context would be secured by *śaivalāsaṅgam*. This has the advantage that it echoes a verse in Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* (5.9), which is likely to have been in the

Similarly, the Bhāgalpur copper-plate inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla (r.c. 860–917) records his establishing a Śiva and granting a village to it and the association of Pāśupatācāryas (*pāśupatācāryapariṣaṭ*) attached to the foundation; and though it gives him the epithet *paramasaugataḥ* it reports that he had been responsible for the building of a vast number of other temples for this deity.[234]

We have even more striking evidence of this kind in the case of Nayapāla. His Siyān stone slab inscription (*EI* 39:7) devotes most of its sixty-five verses (21–63) to detailing an extensive program of royal temple building and image installation undertaken throughout the Pāla realm. Damage to the inscription has removed the name of the king who was responsible for this program, but it is extremely unlikely that it was other than Nayapāla, since the account follows immediately on that of his martial exploits, following those of his predecessors. These pious activities comprise the construction of a temple topped by golden lions and a finial, evidently therefore a Vaḍabhī temple for a goddess,[235] with a temple of Śiva and an attached two-storied monastery (*maṭho dvibhūmiḥ*) for the accommodation of ascetics to its south (v. 24), a temple with a [golden] finial,

---

memory of the author of the inscription, to the effect that during the austerities that Pārvatī undertook to win the hand of Śiva her face was just as charming with her ascetic's braids as it had been with her elegantly adorned coiffure; for, says Kālidāsa: "The lotus is not beautiful only when when lines of bees hover about it but even when [strands of] duckweed cling to it" (*na ṣaṭpadaśreṇibhir eva paṅkajaṃ saśaivalāsaṅgam api prakāśate*). However, this solution has the weakness that it is not open to any obvious explanation of how the error arose. Perhaps the person who wrote the letters on the stone before they were engraved was thinking of Vāmarāśi's official status in Benares. If that, as is very likely, was as the abbot of a Śaiva monastery, then the error *-ādhīśam* might be the result of the intrusion into his mind of an expression such as *śaivādhīśam*, *śaivamaṭhādhīśam*, or *śaivālayādhīśam*. For the expression *maṭhādhīśaḥ* (=*maṭhādhipatiḥ*) see, e.g., *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 7.298ab: *bhaṭṭārakamaṭhādhīśaḥ sādhur vyomaśivo jaṭī*; and the anonymous *Kumārapāladevacarita* v.51a: *taṃ nimantrya maṭhādhīśaṃ* (called *maṭhādhipatiḥ* in v.49b). But this would be more convincing if the reading corrupted were closer to *śaivalādhīśam* in written appearance or pronunciation. Citraghaṇṭā has her temple in Benares near that of Śiva Citragupteśvara as one of the Nine Durgās. The sense intended may be that he had [new] shrines built for all nine of these goddesses.

[234] HULTZSCH 1886, ll. 28–29: *paramasaugato mahārājādhirājaśrīvigrahapāla-devapādānudhyātaḥ parameśvaraḥ paramabhaṭṭārako mahārājādhirājaḥ śrīmannārāyaṇapāladevaḥ* ...; ll. 38–41: *matam astu bhavatāṃ* | *kalaśapote mahārājādhirājaśrīnārāyaṇapāladevena svayaṃkāritasahasrāyatanasya tatra pratiṣṭhāpitasya bhagavataḥ śivabhaṭṭārakasya pāśupata-ācāryapariṣadaś ca* | *yathārhaṃ pūjābalicarusattranavakarmādyarthaṃ śayanāsanaglānapratyaya-bhaiṣajyapariṣkārādyarthaṃ* | *anyeṣām api svābhimatānāṃ* | *svaparikalpita-vibhāgena anavadyabhogārthaṃ ca* | *yathoparilikhitamuktikāgrāmaḥ* .... I agree with HULTZSCH that *svayaṃkāritasahasrāyatanasya* here means '[Śiva] for whom he [Nārāyaṇapāla] himself has built a thousand temples'.

presumably for Śiva, since it was equipped with eleven [subsidiary] shrines in which the eleven Rudras were installed (v. 25), a Vaḍabhī temple for the Mother Goddess[236] and a series of temples for the Nine Durgās,[237] a lofty temple for Śiva Hetukeśvara at Devīkoṭa,[238] a temple of Śiva Kṣemeśvara with a golden

---

[235] Verse 23ab: *[su]dhāśubhraṃ kāñcanasiṃhakumbhaśirasaṃ* .... That a Vaḍabhī temple housing an image of a goddess should be distinguished from others by being surmounted by [two] lions and a finial, and that Vaḍabhī temples are principally for the housing of goddesses, is prescribed in the Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantras, Tantras, that is, which specialize in temple construction and installation. See *Mayasaṃgraha*, f. 28r–v (5.86c–89): *vasvaṃśe ṣoḍaśatyāgāt sūryasaṃvardhitāyatiḥ* ‖ 87 *caturdānāt puraḥ siddhaśukāghro vaḍabhiḥ smṛtaḥ* | *prāsādo vyaktaliṅgeṣu netareṣūdito budhaiḥ* ‖ 88 *vistārād dviguṇotsedhaḥ phaṃsādikṛtasaṃvṛtiḥ* | *pārśve siṃhadvayopeto madhye kalaśabhūṣitaḥ* ‖ 89 *padaikasārdhabhittir vā sapādadviguṇonnatiḥ* ‖ *viśeṣato 'mbikādīnāṃ saṃnidhisthānam īritam*; *ibid.*, f. 29v (vv. 119–121): *vaḍabhyām ambikādevyāḥ keśarī garuḍo hareḥ* | *śriyo dvipo vṛṣaḥ śambhoḥ savituḥ kamalo 'thavā* ‖ *tad anyeṣāṃ ca devānāṃ svāyudham vā hitaṃ param* | *svacihnaparamaṃ yad vā nijakalpoktam eva vā* ‖ *yad utpattisthitidhvaṃsakāraṇaṃ viśvatomukham* | *bhāti sarvātmano mūrdhni sā cūḍā gaditā budhaiḥ*; f. 28v (5.89cd), referring to the Vaḍabhī type of temple: *viśeṣato 'mbikādīnāṃ saṃnidhisthānam īritam*. The sections of this and other unpublished Śaiva works (*Bṛhatkālottara*, *Piṅgalāmata*, *Devyāmata*, and *Mohacūḍottara*) that deal with the building and design of the various kinds of temple are being edited, translated, and analyzed in a doctoral thesis being prepared by my pupil Elizabeth Harris.

[236] Verse 26: *mātuḥ kṛte 'traiva *suvarṇakumbhabhrājiṣṇumūrdhāṃ* (em. : *suvarṇakumbhabharājiṣṇumūrdhāṃ* Ed.) *valabhīṃ śilābhiḥ* | [20 syllables obliterated] *devī*.

[237] Verse 27: *śailāni mandirāṇy atra mandarāṅkāni yāni ca* | + + + + + + + + *kṛtā yā nava caṇḍikāḥ* 'and here stone temples of the Mandara kind ... the Nine Caṇḍikās'. The Nine Caṇḍikās are surely the eighteen-armed form of Mahiṣāsuramardinī Durgā known as Ugracaṇḍā and her eight sixteen-armed ancillaries Rudracaṇḍā, Pracaṇḍā, Caṇḍogrā, Caṇḍanāyikā, Caṇḍā, Caṇḍavatī, Caṇḍarūpā, and Aticaṇḍikā. They are nine to match the nine days of the autumnal Navarātra festival. For these goddesses, also called the Nine Durgās, see *Agnipurāṇa* 50.7–11 and 185.3–10; and Vidyāpati, *Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī*, p. 198. That Nayapāla had [nine] temples built for these goddesses is in keeping with the preferred option of *Agnipurāṇa* 185.3cd: *durgā tu navagehasthā ekāgārasthitāthavā* 'Durgā may be in nine temples or one'. For a Paddhati for the worship of Ugracaṇḍā and her ancillaries see *Ugracaṇḍāprakaraṇa*.

[238] Verse 28ab: *devikoṭe hetukeśasya śambhor yaḥ prāsādaṃ śailam uccair akārṣīt*. For the Hetukeśvara of Devīkoṭa/Koṭivarṣa (modern Bāṇgarh) see SANDERSON 2001, fn. 4, p. 7; also *Picumata* f. 8r3–4 (3.119c–123), which requires the installation of Hetukeśvara as Bhairava in the northeastern segment of the initiation Maṇḍala: *īśāne tu diśābhāge koṭivarṣaṃ prakalpayet* ‖ 120 *vaṭaṃ tatra samālikhya tatra śūlodakaṃ likhet* | *dikṣu caiva vidikṣu ca śūlaprotā likhet tathā* ‖ 121 *śūla tasyāgrato likhya kuṇḍasyaiva mahātape* | *paṭṭiśaṃ pūrvato nyasya vaṭasyādhas tato priye* ‖ 122 *aṣṭapatraṃ likhet padmaṃ tathaiveha na saṃśayaḥ* | *hetukeśvaram ālikhya sadāśivatanus tathā* ‖ 123 *karṇikāyāṃ mahādevi mahābhairavarūpiṇam* | *rudrāṣṭakasamopetaṃ pūrvavad devi cālikhet*; and *Niśisaṃcāra* f. 17v (4.20–21): *koṭīvarṣe karṇamoṭī*

finial and a water reservoir,[239] a temple of Śiva Varākṣeśvara together with a monastery and reservoir,[240] a temple of Viṣṇu (v. 33), a temple of Ghaṇṭīśa and of Bhairava surrounded by the sixty-four Mothers 'in his own city',[241] a temple of Śiva Vaṭeśvara at Campā,[242] and a Vaḍabhī temple on a hill-top with a flight of

---

mahābalakulodbhavā | *śūlahastā sthitā devi sarvayogeśvareśvarī* ‖ *tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi vaṭavṛkṣasamāśritā* | *kṣetrapālo mahākā[yo] hetuko nāma nāmataḥ*. The origin myth of the cult of Hetukeśvara, Bahumāṃsā (=Karṇamoṭī/Cāmuṇḍā/Carcikā), and the other Mothers (Mātṛs) at Koṭivarṣa is narrated in chapter 171 of the early *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*. Śiva promises the Mothers there that he will compose Tantras of the Mothers (*mātṛtantrāṇi*) to guide their worship. The names of these reveal them to be the Yāmalatantras; see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4.

[239] Verse 30: *kṣemeśvarasyāyatanaṃ kṣemaṅkaro grāvamayaṃ smarāreḥ* | *cakāra yo mūrdhni dīptāyataśātakumbhakumbhaṃ vyadhāt tatra mahāsaraś ca*. In a passage describing Varendrī (3.1–27) in the *Rāmacarita*, completed in the time of Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161) but relating events that occurred during the reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), Saṃdhyākaranandin devotes six verses to the deities of the region (3.2–7). There Kṣemeśvara appears with Hetvīśvara or with Hetvīśvara and Caṇḍeśvara as one of only two or three deities individualized by a personal name (3.2–5: *kurvadbhiḥ śaṃ devena śrīhetvīśvareṇa devena* | *caṇḍeśvarābhidhānena kila kṣemeśvareṇa ca sanāthaiḥ* ‖ ... *saṃbhāvitākaluṣabhāvām*), the others mentioned being generic: the twelve Ādityas, the eleven Rudras, Skanda, Vināyaka, the Vasus, the Viśvadevas, and the Lokapālas. Hetvīśvara here is surely identical with the Hetukeśvara of Koṭivarṣa mentioned above. As a synonymous form it was probably substituted for metrical convenience. It is not clear from the Sanskrit whether Saṃdhyākaranandin intended Caṇḍeśvara to be understood as an alias of Kṣemeśvara or as the name of third local Śiva. I am not aware at present of any external evidence that removes this doubt.

[240] Verse 32: ... *maṭhaṃ ca sarasīṃ ca* | *dhāma varākṣeśvara iti śambhor api śailam uttālam*.

[241] Verse 35: *ghaṇṭīśaṃ yaḥ svanagare nyadhāt kṣemāya dehinām* | *catuḥṣaṣṭyā ca mātṝṇāṃ parītaṃ tatra bhairavam*. This Ghaṇṭīśa is perhaps a double of the Mahāghaṇṭeśvara/Mahāghaṇṭa identified by the *Picumata* (3.77c–83) as the Bhairava of Virajā, modern Jajpur in the Cuttack District of Orissa, formerly the capital of the Bhauma-Kara kings: *āgneye* (em. : *āgneyaṃ* Cod.) *virajāyāṃ tu trikūṭaṃ tatra cālikhet* | 78 *nānāvṛkṣasamākīrṇaṃ ulūkaiś copaśobhitam* | *nandiñ ca chagalaṃ caiva kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalam* ‖ 79 *hetukaṃ tatra deveśaṃ śmaśānena *samaṃ nyaset* (conj : *samabhyaset* Cod.) | *tatropari likhec chaktiṃ karañjaṃ ca mahādrumam* ‖ 80 *tasyādhastāl likhet padmam aṣṭapatraṃ sakarṇikam* | *karṇikāyāṃ likhed devaṃ mahāghaṇṭaṃ tu bhairavam* ‖ 81 *kaṭideśe tathā caiva ghaṇṭāsaptavibhūṣitam* | *rudrāṣṭakasamopetaṃ bhairavākārarūpibhiḥ* ‖ 82 *rudrāṇāṃ bāhyato devi yoginyaḥ ṣaṭ samālikhet* | *yamaghaṇṭā karālā ca mahājihvā kharānanā* ‖ 83 *karālī danturā caiva nāmaiś caitāḥ prakīrtitāḥ* | *rudracakraṃ ca saṃveṣṭya ṣaḍdikṣu ca kramāt sthitāḥ*; and 3.136cd (f. 8v2–3): *āgneye mahāghaṇṭeśvaraṃ likhet*; 30.25cd: *āgneyapaṅkaje caiva mahāghaṇṭeśvaraṃ nyaset*. Ghaṇṭīśa- is evidently Ghaṇṭeśa- modified by Middle-Indic Sandhi (*-a* / *ā* + *ī-* > *-'ī-*).

[242] Verse 38: *vaṭeśvarasya vikaṭaś campāyām ālayo 'śmabhiḥ* | *yena vyadhāyi navamaḥ kulācala ivocchritaḥ*. Campā was the capital of Aṅga in the eastern part of the

steps for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā) previously established by king Mahendrapāla,[243] the re-excavation of the step-well (*vāpī*) of the sage Mataṅga at Dharmāraṇya, the building of a lofty temple of Śiva Mataṅgeśvara at that site (v. 43),[244] the building of a temple of Lakṣmī (v. 44), the erecting of a golden Triśūla at Sāgara (v. 45),[245] the building of a temple of the Sun-god (v. 46), the provision of a golden cover for [the Liṅga of] Śiva Vaidyanātha,[246] the installation of a golden finial on the temple of Śiva Aṭṭahāsa (v. 50),[247] the making of a silver image of Sadāśiva, golden images of Caṇḍikā and Gaṇeśa (v. 53) with golden pedestals, a Moon-god, a Sun-god of silver, a golden lotus engraved with images of the Nine Planets (vv. 54–55)—all these are ancillary deities of Śaiva worship—, and a bejewelled golden Śiva (v. 56), the building of a monastery and the installation in it of an image of Viṣṇu in his [Pāñcarātrika] Vaikuṇṭha form (v. 61), and the building of a high Vaḍabhī temple for the goddess Piṅgalāryā.[248] A few other temples and one monastery are mentioned in the inscription (vv. 21–22, 31, 36–37, 39, 41–42, 47, 52, and 59–60), but their affiliation is not stated or has been lost through damage to the stone.[249]

It is striking that most of these constructions and images are Śaiva or Śākta Śaiva and that not one is Buddhist. It is unlikely, however, that Nayapāla had rejected the Buddhist leanings so marked in this dynasty. For in addition to the evidence of his being called *paramasaugataḥ* there is the fact that Tāranātha

---

modern state of Bihar.

[243] Verse 40: *mahendrapālacarcāyā mahendrasadṛśodayaḥ | yaḥ śailīṃ vaḍabhīṃ śaile sopānena sahākarot*. Carcā/Carcikā is the fearsome emaciated goddess commonly known as Cāmuṇḍā or Karṇamoṭī; see here p. 231.

[244] Dharmāraṇya is at Gayā in southern Bihar. Its Mataṅga hermitage, its step-well of Mataṅga, and its temple of Mataṅgeśvara are mentioned in *Agnipurāṇa* 115.34–36.

[245] This is probably Gaṅgāsāgara/Gaṅgāsāgarasaṃgama, where the Ganges flows into the Bay of Bengal, listed in Śaiva sources as one of the Śaiva sacred power sites, e.g., in the list of the *siddhikṣetrāṇi* given in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, f. 42r1–3 (*Niśvāsaguhyasūtra* 1.29–33b).

[246] Verse 48: *kholam akāri rukmaracitaṃ śrīvaidyanāthasya tat*. Temples of Śiva Vaidyanātha are found in various parts of the subcontinent. However, SIRCAR is no doubt correct in his annotation of this inscription (*EI* 39, p. 41) that this is the Vaidyanātha of Deoghar (24°29′ N, 86°42′ E) in Jharkhand, this being revered as one of Śiva's twelve Jyotirliṅgas.

[247] Perhaps at Aṭṭahāsa, now Labpur (23°50′ N, 87°49′ E) in the Bhirbhum District of Bengal. The name of the Śiva at this Śaiva and Śākta sacred site is Mahānāda (e.g. *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 20.53ab: *mahānādasya nāthasya cāṭṭahāsākhyam eva hi | vimalaṃ vimalasyoktaṃ sthānaṃ rudrasya śobhanam*); but Aṭṭahāsa being nearly a synonym as well as the name of the site may have been an alias.

[248] Verse 63cd: *iyam api valabhī grāvabhir uttuṅgā piṅgalāryāyāḥ*.

[249] In addition v. 34 records the founding of a hospital (*ārogyaśālā*), and v. 57 gifts to brahmins.

reports that Nayapāla had a Buddhist preceptor in the person of Mahāvajrāsana Puṇyākaragupta.[250]

Buddhist Kings of Eastern India and their Commitment to Brahmanism

Nor is it the case that royal devotion to the Buddha in eastern India during this period weakened in this region the traditional commitment of Indian rulers to the imposition and preservation of the caste-based brahmanical social order in which Śaivism was embedded. For in the Neulpur grant of the Bhauma-Kara king Śubhākara I his grandfather Kṣemaṅkara is described both as a Buddhist and as having ensured that the members of the caste-classes and disciplines observed their prescribed roles;[251] in his Teruṇḍiā copper-plate inscription Śubhākara II, the grandson of Śubhākara I, is given the epithet *paramasaugataḥ* yet is also commended for having 'propagated the system of uncommingled caste-classes and disciplines proper to the [perfect] Kṛta Age following the unexcelled [brahmanical] scriptures';[252] the Pāla Dharmapāla is described in a grant of his son Devapāla both as a *paramasaugataḥ* and as taking measures to ensure that castes that erred were made to adhere to their respective duties, thereby discharging his father's debt to his deceased ancestors;[253] and Vigrahapāla III is described in his Āṃgāchi copper-plate as the support of the four caste-classes.[254] Moreover, most of the surviving inscriptions of the Pālas, Candras, and Bhauma-Karas record grants which they made in favour of Brahmins. The Rāmpāl copper-plate grant of the Candra Śrīcandra strikingly exhibits the extent to which this double allegiance was unproblematic for such Buddhist donors. Following a practice widely attested in non-Buddhist donative inscriptions the gift of land is said to have been made over to its brahmin recipient after the pouring of water and the performance of a fire-sacrifice, in this case a *koṭihomaḥ*.[255] This is simply adapted to the donor's faith by dedicating the offerings to the Buddha rather than to Śiva or Viṣṇu.[256]

---

[250] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 185, ll. 7–9: *rgyal po 'dis rdo rje gdan pa chen por grags pa la mchod de | de dge bsnyen gyi dus kyi mtshan pu ṇya shrī | rab tu byung ba'i mtshan pu ṇya ā ka ra gu pta'o* 'This king [Neyapāla] venerated [the teacher] called Mahāvajrāsana. During his time as a lay Buddhist, his name was Puṇyaśrī. His ordination name was Puṇyākaragupta'; *HBI*, p. 305. In Tāranātha's text the name of the king is given as Neyapāla. But there can be no doubt that it is Nayapāla that is meant. For there is no other Pāla whose name 'Neyapāla' approximates. and Tāranātha's chronology of Neyapāla fits this king's reign. He relates that his reign began shortly before Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (Atīśa) left for Tibet, which is not far out, since Nayapāla came to the throne in approximately 1027 and Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna set out for Tibet in 1038.

[251] *EI* 15:1, l. 2: *svadharmāropitavarṇāśramaḥ paramopāsako* ... *śrīkṣemaṅkaradevaḥ*.

[252] *EI* 28:36, ll. 8–10: *paramasaugata[ḥ]* ... *niratiśayaśāstrānusārapravartitakṛtayugocitāsaṅkīrṇavarṇāśramavyavasthaḥ*.

[253] The Mungir copper-plate grant of Devapāla, KIELHORN 1892, p. 255, l. 28: *paramasaugataparameśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaśrīdharmapāladevapādānudhyātaḥ paramasaugataḥ parameśvara<ḥ> paramabhaṭṭārako mahārājādhirāja<ḥ> śrīmān devapāladeva<ḥ>*; and ll. 8–9 (v. 5): *śāstrārthabhājā calato 'nuśāsya varṇān pratiṣṭhāpayatā svadharme | śrīdharmapālena sutena so 'bhūt svargasthitānām anṛṇaḥ pitṝṇām* '[Gopāla] became free of his debt to his ancestors in heaven through his son Dharmapāla, who, adhering to the teachings of the [brahmanical] Śāstras, after chastising those [members of] caste-classes that stray makes them adhere to their prescribed duties'. Cf. *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.65.55: *varṇāśramavyavasthā tu tathā kāryā viśeṣataḥ | svadharmapracyutān rājā svadharme viniyojayet* 'The king must above all establish the castes-classes and disciplines with the proper distinctions between each. He should force those

It seems, then, that royal patronage, reflecting no doubt the balance of allegiance in the wider population, ensured that Buddhism, for all the liberal support it received from the Pālas, was in no position to oust or diminish Śaivism, even in this region. The monasteries themselves reflect this symbiosis. The excavations at Somapura revealed an abundance of non-Buddhist deities, particularly Śiva, among the stone relief sculptures around the base of the central temple and the very numerous terracotta plaques that decorated its walls.[257]

---

who fall from their prescribed duties to carry them out'; and the Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla, HULTZSCH 1886, v. 2cd: *maryādāparipālanaikanirataḥ śauryālayo 'smād abhūd dugdhāmbhodhivilāsahāsamahimā śrīdharmapālo nṛpaḥ* 'After him came King Dharmapāla. He was solely dedicated to the maintenance of the boundaries [between the caste-classes and disciplines]; he was the very abode of heroism [in war]; and the glory [of his fame] shone dazzlingly white like the ocean of milk'.

[254] *EI* 15:18, v. 13c: *cāturvarṇyasamāśrayaḥ*.

[255] On the brahmanical *koṭihomaḥ* see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 382–383.

[256] *EI* 12:18, ll. 28–29: *vidhivad udakapūrvakaṃ kṛtvā koṭihomaṃ bhagavate bhagavantaṃ buddhabhaṭṭārakam uddiśya mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye* ... 'According to rule, after pouring water [upon the hand of the recipient] and after performing a *koṭihomaḥ* for the Lord and dedicating it to the Lord Buddha, to add to the merit and fame of my parents and myself ...'. Cf., e.g., *EI* 21:37 (the Śaktipur copper-plate of Lakṣmaṇasena, r. 1179–1206), lines 42–44: *vidhivad udakapūrvakaṃ bhagavantaṃ śrīnārāyaṇabhaṭṭārakam uddiśya mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye*; EI *21*:28 (the Pālanpur plates of Caulukya Bhīmadeva of Gujarat), A.D. 1063, ll. 5–6: *maheśvaram abhyarcya mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye* .... We find a similar case in the Āṃgāchi grant of Vigrahapāla III (*EI* 15:18, ll. 35–40), but with the omission of the fire-sacrifice: *mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye bhagavantaṃ buddhabhaṭṭārakam uddiśya* ....

[257] DIKSHIT 1938, pp. 39, 41–42, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, and 58, commenting (p. 58) that brahmanical and Buddhist gods are equally and promiscuously represented on the terracotta plaques, and that among the brahmanical deities Śiva is the most frequently represented both on those and in the stone relief sculptures. For the forms of Śiva found here see his Plates XXX*a–d*, XXXI*a–e*, XXXIX*f* (Liṅga), XLI *d*-2, and XLIV *a* and *e*, LVI*e* (Mukhaliṅga), and LVIII*a* (Umāmaheśvara).

Excavations of the Vikramaśīla monastery also uncovered a mix of Buddhist and predominantly Śaiva non-Buddhist images, the latter Śiva, Umāmaheśvara, Śiva and Pārvatī, Bhairava, Mahiṣāsuramardinī, Pārvatī, Kaumārī, Cāmuṇḍā, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, the Navagraha, Vṛṣabha, Viṣṇu, and Sūrya.[258]

Joint Patronage of Buddhism and Śaivism in the Kingdoms of the Khmers, Chams, and Javanese

Much the same phenomenon can be seen in Southeast Asia among the Khmers, the Chams, and the Javanese. Among the first the dominant religion was Śaivism until the rise of the Theravāda that accompanied the decline of Angkor, and Tantric Buddhism, even when it enjoyed short periods of prominence through exceptionally determined royal patronage, found itself bound, as I have shown elsewhere, to accommodate its rival.[259]

In the kingdoms of the Chams, speakers of an Austronesian language who inhabitated the plains along the coast of the South China Sea in what is now the central part of Vietnam, most of the inscriptions that have survived, in Sanskrit and Old Cham, ranging in time from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries, record acts of royal piety to Śiva or to goddesses identified with his consort. There are also a few from the ninth and tenth centuries that record the installation of Tantric Mahāyānist Lokeśvaras, the construction of associated Vihāras, and land-grants to these. But as in eastern India we find in these that single donors supported both religions. Indeed the situation is more striking here because in all but one case each of these inscriptions records a person's practising both kinds of patronage, Buddhist and Śaiva.[260] Thus in the Bakul stele of 829 a Buddhist monk Sthavira Buddhanirvāṇa records that his father Samanta has donated two Vihāras to the Buddha and two temples to Śiva.[261] The Dong Duong stele of 875 records that King Jayendavarman *alias* Lakṣmīndra enshrined a Lakṣmīndralokeśvara and an associated Vihāra, yet the bulk of this long inscription is devoted to the praise of the Śiva Bhadreśvara, who, we are told, is the source of this dynasty's power and prosperity.[262] The Nhan-bieu stele records that in 908 Pov kluñ Sudaṇḍa[vā]sa and his son Pov kluñ Dharmapātha installed a Śiva Devaliṅgeśvara and in 911, the year of the inscription, built a Vihāra for a Vṛddhalokeśvara, which is to say, a Vihāra associated with a deity Vṛddhalokeśvara, which was installed there around this time since it is evident from its name that it was established with the name of their grandmother, princess Lyaṅ Vṛddhakulā, the grandmother of the senior wife of Jayasiṃhavarman I.[263] A stele at Mi-son of 1092 records that King Jayendravarman (*alias* Paramabuddhaloka), described as versed both in the Mahāyāna and in the brahmanical Dharmaśāstras, established two Buddhist deities, a Buddhalokeśvara and a Jayendralokeśvara, but also two goddesses, a Jayendreśvarī, and an Indragaurīśvarī, both probably Śaiva, and between 1085 and the year of the inscription gave to Śiva Īśānabhadreśvara a Liṅga-sheath of gold and silver alloy adorned with jewels, an inner shrine of sandalwood, silver, gold, and jewels, various items of gold and silver, elephants, and male and female slaves, and beautified his temple with silver and gilded its pinnacles.[264]

---

[258] *IAR* 1974–75, p. 7; 1975–76, p. 7; 1976–77, p. 11; 1977–78, p. 15; 1978–79, p. 43; and 1979–80, p. 13.

[259] On the co-existence of Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism in the Khmer kingdom of Angkor see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. pp. 421–435.

[260] The exception is the An-thui stele of 902 (HUBER 1911, pp. 277–282), which records that the Buddhist monk Sthavira Nāgapuṣpa, a close associate of Bhadravarman II, installed a Pramuditalokeśvara, and also that this king made a land-grant to the associated monastery (Pramuditalokeśvaravihāra).

[261] *ISCC*, pp. 237–241.

[262] FINOT 1904a, pp. 84–99.

This co-ordination of the two faiths is also evident in eastern Java. The 'Calcutta' stone inscription of Airlangga (c. 1010–1050), founder of the kingdom of Kahuripan, reports in its Old Javanese section that he was consecrated as the king in 1019/20 by Buddhist (Saugata), Śaiva (Māheśvara), and Mahābrāhmaṇa dignitaries;[265] and much evidence of the simultaneous royal support of both Śaivism and Buddhism during the Singhasari and Majapahit periods (1222–1292, 1293–c. 1500) is present in the Old Javanese poem *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, also called *Deśawarṇana*, completed in 1365 by Mpu Prapañca during the reign of Hayām Wuruk of Majapahit, consecrated as Rājasanagara (1350–1389). We learn from this work that both Śaiva and Buddhist priests participated in periodic ceremonies for the benefit of the realm within the great courtyard inside the royal gate of the palace compound,[266] that the administrative heads

---

[263] HUBER 1911, pp. 299–311.

[264] FINOT 1904b, pp. 970–975.

[265] DE CASPARIS 1992, pp. 482–483; KERN 1885 and 1913, p. 104, ll. 14–15: *mataṅ yan rake halu śrī lokeśvaradharmmawaṃśa airlaṅgānantawikramottuṅgadewasangjñā kāstwan śri mahārāja, de mpuṅku sogata maheśvara mahābrāhmaṇa irikang śākakāla 941* 'Wherefore he was confirmed with blessings by the high dignitaries of the Buddhists, Śaivas, and Mahābrāhmaṇas under the name of Rake Halu Lokeśvara Dharmavaṃśa Airlangga Anantavikramottuṅgadeva in Śāka 941'.

[266] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 8.3–4; PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 13. This event is referred to by PIGEAUD in his translation (1960–63, vol. 3, p. 10) as "purification (ceremonies)". The term used here is the Sanskrit *prāyaścittam* (8.3d: *prāyaścitta ri kālaning *śrawaṇa* [conj. PIGEAUD : *grahaṇa* Cod.] *phalguṇa makaphala haywaning sabhūwana*). The function of the ceremony, therefore, was expiatory: to cancel the effects of any errors, omissions, or excesses in observances and conduct during the period since the last performance. KERN, accepting the reading

(*dharmādhyakṣa*) of these two communities had official quarters in the east and west to the south of the royal compound,[267] and that his sovereign was dedicated

---

grahaṇa phalguṇa, took the occasion to be an eclipse during the month Phālguṇa. As PIGEAUD saw, this is implausible. He therefore proposed that *grahaṇa* is an error for *śrawaṇa* 'the month Śrāvaṇa', making this ceremony bi-annual and noting that the resulting timing coincides with that of the two major festivals of the Majapahit court (1960–63, vol. 2, pp. 21–22). A trace of this co-functionality has survived into modern times on the island of Bali, where there are both Śaiva and Buddhist priests (*padanda*), with the latter now forming a small minority, about 1 in 10 and less than twenty in all (HOOYKAAS 1973, pp. 5 and 8), which sometimes had a role in state-sponsored rituals (STUART-FOX 2002, PP. 324 AND 326)).

[267] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 12.5; PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 25. For a map showing the location of these quarters within the palace compound (*kraton*) see HALL 1996, p. 99. PIGEAUD claims (*ibid.*) that both are regularly mentioned in the preambles of the royal charters of Majapahit. This is so in the Decree Jaya Song of c. 1350, the Ferry Charter of 1358, and the undated Charter of Batur (PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 1, pp. 104–114 [edition]; vol. 3, pp. 151–164 [translation]). They are named in the first after the ministers: the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas (*dharmmadhyakṣa ring kaśewan*), Rājaparākrama, *alias* Dharmarāja, and the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists (*dharmmadhyakṣa ring kasogatan*) Āryādhirāja Kanakamuni, described as a master of the Buddha's teachings and grammar (*boddhaśāstrawayākaraṇaparisamāpta*). In the second the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists has become Nādendra, described in the same way (*boddhatarkkawyākaraṇaśāstraparisamāpta*) and we learn that the second name Dharmarāja of the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas is his *nāma puṣpapāta*, that is to say, the name he acquired during his initiation through the casting of a flower (*puṣpapātaḥ*) in accordance with standard Śaiva procedure (e.g. *Svacchandatantra* 4.62cd: *puṣpapātavaśān nāma kārayet sādhakasya tu* 'He should name the Sādhaka in accordance with the casting of the flower'; *Bṛhatkālottara* f. 91v4 : *puṣpapātānusāreṇa saṃjñā *tatpūrvato* [em. : *tatpātrato* Cod.] *hitā* 'The [element of the] name before that [such as -śiva which indicates the initiate's caste] should be [given] in accordance with the casting of the flower'). In the third the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists is Āryādhirāja [Kanakamuni], as in the first, described as a master of grammar and the [Buddhist] Tantras (*wyakaraṇatantraparisamāpta*), and that of the Śaivas is Ārya Harṣarāja, described as a master of logic and grammar (*nyāyawyakaraṇaśāstraparisamāpta*). They are mentioned along with a number of other learned men, six in the first, seven in the second, and five in the third, referred to as "teachers of Law and settlers of law suits" (*dharmmaprawakta wyawahārawicchedaka*) in the first and second and as "settlers of law suits as valid or not" (*nyāyānyāyawyawahārawicchedaka*) in the third. They are no doubt the officials referred to elsewhere as the Dharmopapattis (see here p.105). In the first they are (1) Śiwanātha, (2) Marmanātha, (3) Smaranātha, (4) Jayasmara, (5) Agreśwara, and (6) Munīndra. In the second they are (1) Śiwanātha, (2) Agreśwara, (3) Jayasmara, (4) Widyānātha, (5) Śiwādhipa, (6) Śrīghana, and (7) Samatājñāna. In the third they are (1) Marmanātha, (2) Smaranātha, (3) Mahānātha, (4) a second Smaranātha, and (5) Agreśwara. Munīndra in the first and Śrīghana and Samatājñāna in the second were Buddhists, a fact already evident from their names but confirmed by the charters' reports of their fields of expert knowledge. We learn from the first charter that Śiwanātha, Smaranātha, and Agreśvara were adherents of the Bhairava sect (*bhairawapakṣa*), that is to say, Śākta Śaivas, and that

to the support of both religions (81.1–2). Moreover, in the opening verse of his poem he pays homage to him as Śiva-Buddha in human form.[268]

Particularly striking are passages that report the deity-images or temples in which the souls of deceased kings had been installed. Ranggah Rājasa (r. 1222–1227), was enshrined in two temples, one Śaiva and and the other Buddhist, in a single temple complex at Kangĕnĕngan;[269] and both Śaiva and Buddhist priests were seated beside king Rājasanagara when he sat in audience after worshipping here.[270] Anūṣapati (r. 1227–1248) was installed in a Śiva image at Kiḍal;[271] Viṣṇuvardhana (r. 1248–1268) in a Śiva image at Waleri and a Buddha image

---

Marmanātha and Jayasmara were adherents of the Saura sect (*sorapakṣa*), that is to say, Sūrya worshippers (see here p.58). The second and third charters do not specify the sects of the judges listed, so that the affiliations of Widyānātha, Śiwādhipa, one of the two Smaranāthas, and Mahānātha are unknown. It is striking that these judicial boards included no Vaiṣṇavas. The absence of a representative of the Ṛṣi sect, often grouped with those of the Śaivas and Buddhists as one of the three principal denominations in Java (e.g. *Arjunawijaya* 28.1c: *ṛṣi śaiwa sogata*; *Kuñjarakarṇa* 22.3c: *sang boddhaśaiwārṣipakṣa*), is not surprising. For its followers were forest-dwelling hermits. The *Kuñjarakarṇa* associates them with the worship of the [Pāśupata] *pañcakuśika*; see 23.1d: *lwi glar sogata pañcabuddha ṛṣi pañcakuśika wiku śaiwapañcaka*; and Teeuw and Robson 1981, p.26. See also Sanderson 2005a, pp.374–376. The creation of the post of a Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists and the inclusion of Buddhists on the judicial board were perhaps recent developments. For the Sarwadharma charter issued in 1269 during the reign of Kṛtanagara (Pigeaud 1960–1963, vol. 1, pp.99–103 [edition]; vol. 3, pp.143–150) mentions only a Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas (Ācārya Śiwanātha Tanutama: *mpungku dharmmadhyakṣa ri kaśewan ḍang ācāryya śiwanātha mapañji tanutama*) together with a board of five other Ācāryas, Dharmadewa, Smaraḍahana, Smaradewa, another Śiwanātha, and Agraja, not one of whom has an obviously Buddhist name (plate 2, recto, ll. 4–7).

[268] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 1.1bc: *śiwa budḍa sira sakalaniṣkalātmakā* | *sang śrīparwwatanātha* 'The Lord of the Mountain, protector of the unprotected, the holy Śiva-Buddha, who is both manifest [in physical form] and transcendent'. The Lord of the Mountain (*śrīparwwatanātha*) addressed in this verse has been understood, implausibly, as Śiva. I am entirely persuaded by the evidence presented by Supomo (1972; 1977, pp.69–82) that it is the king that is intended in this and the opening verse of Mpu Tantular's *Arjunawijaya*, where the Lord of the Mountain, in this case called Parwwatarājadewa, is identified as the physical manifestation of the ultimate reality that is the Buddha (1.1b: *sang sākṣāt paramārthabuddha*).

[269] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 40.5d: *sang dinārmmadwaya ri kagnangan śśewaboddeng usāna*. Pigeaud translates *dinārmmadwaya* as 'a double *dharma* (religious domain)' (1960–1963, vol. 3, p. 46) and Robson (1995, p. 5) as 'a double temple'. I do not see that the expression, which is equivalent to Skt. *dharmadvayam*, conveys anything more than the fact that there were two temples. Cf. Santoso 1975, p. 54.

[270] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 36.2b: *para wiku śai sogata āryya nāligih iniring nirekhi tān adoḥ*.

[271] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 41.1d: *praḍipa *śiwabimba* (Kerṅ : *śimbha* Pigeaud) *śobhita rikang suḍharmma ri kiḍal*.

at Jajaghu;[272] Kṛtanagara, r. 1268–1292, who is depicted as a devout initiated Tantric Buddhist and described after his death as "liberated in the world of Śiva-Buddha",[273] and was installed in a Śiva-Buddha in "his own place" and, with his queen, Vajradevī, in a Buddhist image combining Vairocana and Locanā at Sagala.[274] Kṛtarājasa Jayavardhana (r. 1293–1309) was installed in a Buddha in the palace and a Śiva at Simping,[275] and Jayanāgara (r. 1309–1326), who is described as having returned to the world of Viṣṇu,[276] in Viṣṇus in the royal compound, Shilā Pĕṭak, and Bubat, and in a Buddha in the form of Amoghasiddhi in Sukhalīla.[277] We also learn that there was a temple founded by Kṛtanagara at Jajawa, located at the foot of the sacred mountain Kukuwus, which was Śaiva but had a Buddhist pinnacle and contained a Śiva with an image of Akṣobhya above its crown, and that both Buddhists and Śaivas worshipped in it.[278] The intimate co-existence of the two traditions is also apparent in the intertextuality of religious texts in Java, as has been demonstrated for the Śaiva *Jñānasiddhānta* and the Tantric Buddhist *Sang hyang Kamahāyānikan* and *Kalpabuddha*.[279] It is also seen in the great frequency with which the Mahāyāna-Buddhist concept of emptiness (*śūnyatā*) is incorporated in Javanese Śaiva sources through the inclusion of the terms *śūnya* and *śūnyatā* among those used to characterize the highest reality,[280] in the readiness of the redactors of Śaiva liturgies to supplement sets of Śaiva elements with Buddhist elements when they needed to make up a total for the sake of the numerical correspondence,[281] and in the fact that the *Kuñjarakarṇa* of the Buddhist Mpu Ḍusun the supreme Buddhist deity Vairocana is made to equate the divine pentads of the Śaiva and [Pāśupata] Ṛṣi sects with the five Tathāgatas, teaching this in the context of an assertion that he is the ultimate reality that assumes the form both of the Buddha and of Śiva,[282] and that it is because the followers of the three sects fail to understand this undifferentiated ground that they dispute with each other for the pre-eminence of their respective Gods.[283] The same idea is seen in the works of the Buddhist Mpu Tantular. In his *Arjunawijaya* he has the priest of a Buddhist temple-complex (*boddhadharma*) explain to Arjuna that its central diety Vairocana is one with Sadāśiva, that its four ancillary deities, the directional Tathāgatas Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi, are one with Rudra, Brahmā, Mahādeva, and Viṣṇu respectively,[284] that there is no distinction between the Buddha and Śiva,[285] and that therefore it is the king's duty to support all three sects, the Buddhists, the Śaivas, and the Ṛṣis.[286] Later, in his *Sutasoma*, Mpu Tantular states that the Buddha and Śiva are "different but one" (*bhinneka tunggal ika*), the famous formula that has been adopted as its official national motto by the modern state of Indonesia, as two manifestations of the ultimate reality of the former.[287]

---

[272] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 41.4b: *ḍinarmma ta sire waleri śiwawimbha len sugatawimbha mungwing jajaghu*.

[273] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 43.5c: *sang mokteng śiwabudḍaloka*. His commitment to Buddhism is indicated in 42.3c (*samaya len brata mapagĕh apākṣa sogata*) and 43.2a (*bhakti ri pada śri śakyasiṃhāsthiti*). As for his involvement in Tantric Buddhism we learn that he received Buddha consecration (*jinābhiṣekaḥ*) and was then given the name Jñānavajreśvara (43.2bc: *lumrā nāma jinābhiṣekanira sang śrī jñānabajreśwara*), that he devoted himself to Tantric worship following the otherwise unknown *Subhūtitantra* as his principal guide (43.3b: *mukyang tantra subhuti rakwa tinngöt kĕmpĕn*), and that he celebrated the esoteric Tantric ritual known as *gaṇacakram* (43.3d), an indication that his Tantrism was that of the *Guhyasamāja* or one of the Yoginītantras. His initiation-name appears in the forms Jñānaśivavajra and Vajrajñānaśiva in the Sanskrit inscription (Kern 1910) on the lotus-cushion of an image of himself in the form of the Mantranaya deity Mahākṣobhya installed at Simpang in Surabaya in 1289 (vv. 12–13: *śrījñānaśivavajrākhyaś cittaratnavibhūṣaṇaḥ* | *jñānaraśmiviśuddhāṅgas saṃbodhijñānapāragaḥ* || *subhaktyā taṃ pratiṣṭhāpya svayaṃ pūrvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam* | *śmaśāne vurarenāmni mahākṣobhyānurūpataḥ*; 19d: *vajrajñānaśivā* + +). All three forms of the name have the appearance of a Śaiva-Buddhist hybrid.

[274] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 43.5d: *riṅke sthānanirān ḍinarmma śiwabudḍārcca halp nottama*; 43.6: *hyang werocana locanā lwiriran ekārcca prakāśeng prajā*.

[275] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 47.3b–d: *drāk pīnratiṣṭa jinawimbha sireng purī jro* | *antaḥpura ywa panlaḥ rikanang suḍarmma śaiwāpratiṣṭa sira teko muwaḥ ri simping*.

[276] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 48.3a: *sang nṛpati mantuk ing haripada*.

[277] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 48.3bcd: *śīghra sirān ḍinarmma ri ḍalm purārccanira wiṣṇuwimbha parama* | *len ri śilā pṭak mwang i bubāt paḍā pratima wiṣṇumūrtty anupama ring sukhalīla tang sugatawimbha śobhitan amoghasiddhi sakala*. His installation in Viṣṇus is without parallel among the Singhasari-Majapahit kings; see Pigeaud 1960–1963, vol. 4, p.141. However, the kings of Kaḍiri, the principal court of East Java through the twelfth century to c. 1222, were devotees of this god. Most were described as his embodiments (de Casparis and Mabbett 1992, p.327) and his incarnations are central to the literary epics (*kakawin*) of the Kaḍiri court (Hall 2005, pp.2 and 8).

[278] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 56.1b–2c: *kīrtti śrī kṛtanāgara prabhū yuyut nareśwara sira* |

---

tĕkwān rakwa sirāngadiṣṭita śarīra tan hana waneḥ etunyang dwaya śaiwa boddha sang amūja ngūni satatā || *chinang caṇḍi ri sor kaśaiwan apucak kaboddḍan i ruhur mwang ri jro śiwawimbha śobhita haḷpnirāparimitā* | *akṣobhyapratime ruhur mmakuṭa tan hanolyantikā* 'It was a temple (*kīrtiḥ*) of Lord Kṛtanāgara, the king's great-grandfather. He himself established it. Hence both Śaivas and Buddhists have from the beginning always conducted the worship. The sign is that the temple is Śaiva in its lower section and Buddhist above. Inside is a beautiful Śiva image and above an image of Akṣobhya as (on?) its crown. Of there is no doubt'. On the significance of the Śaiva-Buddhist fusion seen in Kṛtanagara in both inscriptions and literary works see HUNTER 2007.

[279] See SOEBADIO 1971, pp. 12–19 and 55–57 for evidence of this intertextuality; also for a general treatment of the co-existence of the two traditions in Java ZOETMULDER in STÖHR and ZOETMULDER 1968, pp. 262–314.

[280] See, e.g., *Jñānasiddhānta* 3.2–3: *nādaś ca līyate śūnye śūnyam eva tu jāyate* | *śūnyāc chūnyataraṃ vāpi atyantaśūnyalakṣaṇam* || *sthūlaṃ sakalatattvaṃ ca sūkṣmaṃ sakalaniṣkalam* | *paraṃ niṣkalaśūnyaṃ ca ūrdhvātyūrdhātiśūnyakam*; 8.3: *sthūlaṃ śabdamayaṃ proktaṃ sūkṣmaṃ cittamayaṃ bhavet* | *paraṃ cittavirahitaṃ cittaṃ tyaktvātiśūnyatā*; *Gaṇapatitattva* 2: *śvāso niḥśvāsaḥ saṃyoga ātmatrayam iti smṛtam* | *triśivaṃ tripuruṣatvam aikātmya eva śūnyatā*; 23: *hṛdayasthaṃ sadāśivaṃ hṛdayānte guhyālayaṃ* / *śūnyātiśūnyaṃ cintyate paraṃ kaivalyam ucyate*; *Mahājñāna* 62: *sūryakoṭisahasrāṃśu hṛdayaṃ vimalaṃ śubham* | *hṛdayānte padaṃ śūnyaṃ paraṃ kaivalyaṃ ucyate*; 83: *rātriś ca prakṛtir jñeyā raviś ca puruṣas tathā* | *dyutiś ca vā mahādevaḥ śūnyaṃ ca paramaḥ śivaḥ*. I consider it highly probable that these Sanskrit works are Javanese creations. Some of the verses can be found in Indian Śaiva sources: *Wṛhaspatitattwa* 53 and *Gaṇapatitattwa* 3 < *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* 7.5; *Jñānasiddhānta* 19.5 and and *Gaṇapatitattwa* 43 < *Kiraṇa* 1.23; *Wṛhaspatitattwa* 7–10 < *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 4.3–6. But these are surprisingly few, and the works contain several doctrinal elements that are alien to known Indian traditions. Moreover, the deviations from strict Sanskrit usage found in them seem to me not to be characteristic of the registers of the language seen in Indian Śaiva scriptural texts. The same is true of the frequent deviations from the correct form of the Anuṣṭubh in the second and fourth Pādas: e.g. *Gaṇapatitattwa* 1d, 16d, 48d, 49b, 49d, 54b, 54d, 55b, 59b, 59d; *Mahājñāna* 11d, 37b, 38d, 42b, 61b, 73b, 74b, 78b, 78d, 80d; *Wṛhaspatitattwa* 3b, 6b, 6d, 12b, 20d, 23b, 24b, 25b, 63b, 72d. This is extremely rare in Indian Śaiva texts.

[281] See the example of this cited in SANDERSON 2005a, p. 377.

[282] *Kuñjarakarṇa* 23.1d: *lwir glar sogata pañcabuddha ṛṣi pañcakuśika wiku śaiwa pañcaka* 'As the Buddhists have the five Buddhas, the Ṛṣis have the pentad of Kuśika and the Śaivas a pentad of their own'; 23.4bcd: *ngwang wairocana buddhamūrti śiwamūrti pinakaguru ning jagat kabeh* | *nāham donkw ingaran bhaṭāra guru kaprakaśita tĕka ring sarāt kabeh* | *anghing byāpaka ring samastabhuwanāku juga warawiśeṣadevatā* 'I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śiva, and am accepted as Guru by all. Therefore it is I that am Bhaṭāra Guru, famed among all men, and it is I, as the highest deity, that pervade all the worlds.'

[283] *Kuñjarakarṇa* 22.3.

[284] *Arjunawijaya* 26.4–27.1

[285] *Arjunawijaya* 27.2abc: *ndah kantĕnanya hajī tan hana bheda sang hyang* | *hyang buddha rakwa kalawan śiwa rājadewa* | *kālih samêka sira sang pinakeṣṭidharma*.

[286] *Arjunawijaya* 30.1–2.

[287] *Sutasoma* 139.5: *hyang buddha tan pahi lawan śiwarājadewa* | *rwānekadhātu winuwus warabuddhawiśwa* | *bhinnĕki rakwa ring apa n kĕna parwanôsĕn* | *mangka ng jinatwa kalawan śiwatattwa tunggal* | *bhinnêka tunggal ika tan hana dharma mangrwa*. This has been translated by SUPOMO (1977, p. 7) as follows: "The god Buddha is not different from Śiwa, the lord of the gods. The excellent Buddha, the all-pervading, is said to be two different *dhātu*. Yet although these two *dhātu* are different, how is it possible to differentiate between them at a glance? In the same manner, the reality that is Jina and the reality that is Śiva are one; they are different yet they are one, for there is no duality in the *dharma*". Commenting on "the two different *dhātu*" mentioned in this verse (fn. 9) SUPOMO take them to be the two Maṇḍalas, the Garbhadhātu and the Vajradhātu of the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* and *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* respectively. This reading is an error in my view. It does not accord with context, which requires that the two be the realities of the Buddha (*jinatwa*) and Śiva (*śiwatattwa*) respectively. As I understand it, the passage is saying that the Lord Buddha is both the Buddha

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRIC BUDDHISM THROUGH THE ADOPTION AND ADAPTATION OF ŚAIVA AND ŚĀKTA ŚAIVA MODELS

The Parallel Repertoire of Rituals

Now, this co-existence of Buddhism and Śaivism under royal patronage was surely facilitated by the fact that the form of Buddhism adopted and developed was one that had equipped itself not only with a pantheon of ordered sets of deities that permitted such subsumptive equations but also with a repertoire of Tantric ceremonies that parallelled that of the Śaivas and indeed had modelled itself upon it, offering initiation by introduction before a Maṇḍala in which the central deity of the cult and its retinue of divine emanations have been installed, and a system of regular worship animated by the principle of identification with the deity of initiation (*devatāhaṃkāraḥ*, *devatāgarvaḥ*) through the use of Mantras, Mudrās, visualization, and fire-sacrifice (*homaḥ*); and this was presented not only as a new and more powerful means of attaining Buddha-hood but also, as in the Śaiva case, as enabling the production of supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*) such as the averting of danger (*śāntiḥ*), the harming of enemies (*abhicāraḥ*), and the control of the rain (*varṣāpaṇam* and *ativṛṣṭidhāraṇam*), through symbolically appropriate inflections of the constituents of these procedures. The latter is particularly important from the point of view of Buddhism's relations with its royal patrons, since such rituals enabled it to match the Śaivas by promising kings more tangible benefits than the mere accumulation of merit through the support of the Buddha, his teaching, and the Saṅgha. We have seen an example of such ritual for the protection of the state in Tāranātha's report of the programme of Tantric fire-sacrifices performed at Vikramaśīla under the direction of Buddhajñāna during the reign of Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812) to ensure the longevity of the Pāla dynasty;[288] we have another example in the case of Kīrtipaṇḍita, a Mahāyāna-Buddhist scholar and Tantric expert who according to the Vat Sithor stele inscription became the Guru of the Khmer king Jayavarman V (r. 968–1001) and was engaged by him to perform frequent fire-sacrifices in the palace for the protection of the kingdom;[289] and the Javanese Prapañca tells us that the purpose of king Kṛtanagara's adherence to Tantric Buddhism was

---

and Śiva, whereas SUPOMO's reading makes Mpu Tantular espouse a doctrine of absolute equality between the two religions within a reality beyond both. This is intrinsically implausible in a Buddhist work. My reading makes his view exactly that expressed by Mpu Ḍusun in 23.4bcd of the *Kuñjarakarṇa* cited and translated above: "I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śiva".

[288] See here p.93.

[289] K. 111, CŒDÈS 1937–1966, vol. 6, pp. 195–211, v. 36. See SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 427–428.

to increase his people's prosperity and the stability of his realm, and that its reward was the undiminished and undivided sovereignty (*ekachattra*) of his descendants.[290]

The adoption of the Śaiva practice of Maṇḍala initiation created a further line of access to patronage and was propagated vigorously, as it was by the Śaivas, as a means of the recruiting of social élites both in the subcontinent and beyond.[291] Among the Buddhist Tantras at least two major texts teach rituals of initiation, or consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*) as it is called in these sources, in which it is kings in particular and royalty in general that are envisaged as the primary initiands. These are the *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* and the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*.[292] In the former this is so for the principal Kalpa of the text. In the latter it is characteristic of initiation into the secondary Maṇḍalas of the four Great Kings and the ten Guardians of the Directions taught in the *Uttarakalpa*. The sections dealing with these Maṇḍalas specify the king as the principal consecrand, teach little or no required subsequent practice, and promise benefits that apply principally to him, namely the protection of himself and his kingdom and the destruction of the kingdoms of his enemies. The monarch is not mentioned in the treatments of initiation given in the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* and *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, the two great Tantras that were translated into Chinese in the early eighth century to form the basis of the Way of Mantras there and in the Japanese Shingon and Tendai sects. But the ninth-century Indian authority Ānandagarbha brings this aspect of the religion to the fore in his *Sarvavajrodaya*, an influential manual that sets out detailed practical guidance for the performance of the initiation ritual taught in the second of those texts but draws heavily on the more detailed treatment in the first. For when he teaches the preparation of the Maṇḍala he prescribes a range of sizes beginning with that appropriate for the initiation of the monarch. In his case each of the sides should measure one hundred or fifty cubits (about 40 and 20 metres), in the case of a feudatory (*sāmantaḥ*) or major feudatory (*mahāsāmantaḥ*) fifty or twenty-five, in the case of a wealthy merchant (*śreṣṭhī*) or international trader (*sārthavāhaḥ*) twenty-five or half of that, and in the case of an ordinary practitioner (*sādhakaḥ*) twelve or six (about 5 or 2.5 metres).[293]

---

[290] *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 42.3d: *tumīrwa sang atītarāja ring usāna magĕhakna wṛdḍining jagat*; 43.3c: *pūjā yoga samāḍi pinrihiran amriḥ sthityaning rāt kabeḥ*; 43.4cd: *ḍarmmeṣṭāpagĕh ing jinabrata mahotsāheng prayogakriya nāhan hetuni tusni tusnira paḍaikaccatra dewaprabhu*.

[291] On the adoption by the Buddhists of the practice of royal initiation and its propagation in India, Tibet, Mongolia, China, Japan, and Southeast Asia see SANDERSON forthcoming *a*.

[292] *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*, p. 32, ll. 21, 23, and 28–30; *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*, sections 47b, 48a, and 49a.

The Mantranaya also followed the example of the Śaivas by devising Tantric ceremonies for patrons in the public domain: for the consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*) of temple images (*pratimā*), paintings of deities on cloth (*paṭaḥ*), manuscripts of sacred texts (*pustakam*), monasteries (*vihāraḥ*), shrines (*gandhakuṭī*), Caityas, reservoirs (*puṣkariṇyādi*), gardens and the like (*ārāmādi*). It also adapted the Śaiva procedures for funerary initiation to produce a Tantric Buddhist funeral

---

[293] *Sarvavajrodaya*, f. 29r5-29v1: *evaṃ kṛtvā pūrvasevāṃ maṇḍalam ālikhet. ... rājño hastaśataṃ pañcāśaddhastaṃ vā sāmantamahāsāmantānāṃ pañcāśat pañcaviṃśatihastaṃ vā śreṣṭhinaḥ sārthavāhasya vā pañcaviṃśatiṃ tadardhaṃ vā sādhakānāṃ dvādaśahastaṃ ṣaḍḍhastaṃ vā.*

[294] The details of this wide repertoire of the rituals that a Tantric Buddhist officiant (Vajrācārya) was called on to perform are set out in a number of manuals that are closely comparable to the Paddhatis of the Śaivas, notably the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā* of Kuladatta (TANEMURA 2004b), the *Vajrāvalī* of the great Abhayākaragupta of Vikramaśīla (1064–1125 according to the chronological tables of Sum pa mkhan po Yes shes dpal 'byor [1704–1788]; works dated in the twenty-fifth, thirtieth, and thirty-seventh years of the reign of Rāmapāla [c. 1072–1126]; *Vajrāvalī* written before the first of these; see BÜHNEMANN and TACHIKAWA 1991, pp. xiv–xvi), which adds procedures for the consecration of reservoirs, gardens, and the like (A, f. 2r1 in the list of topics: *pratimādipratiṣṭhā | puṣkariṇyādipratiṣṭhā | ārāmādipratiṣṭhā*), and the *Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya* of Mahāmaṇḍalācārya Jagaddarpaṇa, which incorporates much of the *Vajrāvalī* but adds some new material, notably a final section on the funeral ritual for a deceased Vajrācārya (*nirvṛtavajrācāryāntyeṣṭilakṣaṇavidhiḥ*; B, ff. 240v7–244v4), which is an unacknowledged incorporation of the whole of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* of Paṇḍita Śūnyasamādhivajra (less its two colophonic verses). One other text giving a Tantric funeral procedure survives in Sanskrit, the *Antasthitikarmoddeśa*, at the end (ff. 15r8–15v11) of the *Guhyasamāja*-based *Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Maṇḍalācārya Padmaśrīmitra of the Khasarpaṇa monastery (f. 15v10–11: *samāptā ca maṇḍalopāyikā | kṛtir iyaṃ khasarpaṇīyamaṇḍalācāryapadmaśrīmitrasya*). On these texts and the incorporation of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* by Jagaddarpaṇa see TANEMURA 2004a and 2007. On the Śaiva prototype of funerary initiation see SANDERSON 1995a, pp. 31–33 and, for its adaptation, the *Mṛtoddhāradīkṣā*, in which a simulacrum is substituted for the body of the deceased, 2005b, pp. 264–267. A fourteenth-century Paddhati for this *Mṛtoddhāradīkṣā* survives in ff. 88v1–91r1 of the *Gurupustikā* of the Kashmirian Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha. In an earlier publication (SANDERSON 2007a, p. 395, fn. 549) I proposed that this work, then known to me only indirectly from the *Rājānakavaṃśapraśaṃsā* of his patrilineal descendant Rājānaka Ānanda, who reports that it was composed at the request of [king] Saṃgrāmasiṃha, might be preserved in a Śāradā manuscript listed with this title as belonging to the Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library of the Banaras Hindu University (MS CN. 4115). I can now report that this is indeed a manuscript of that work and, as far as I am aware, its *codex unicus*. The name of the author is confirmed on f. 1v11–12: *karmānupūrvīsmṛtaye keṣāṃcid upayoginīm | śitikaṇṭhas samasyaināṃ vidhatte gurupustikām*; and the claim that he wrote at the request of Saṃgrāmasiṃha is confirmed on f. 13v15–14r1: *asmākaṃ kulaśiṣyeṇa śrīsaṅgrāmamahībhujā | abhyarthitānāṃ dīkṣārtham ayaṃ paddhatidohadaḥ*. I am very grateful in this matter to my former pupil Christopher Wallis, who after

rite (*antyeṣṭiḥ*)[294] for initiates,[295] in which, as in the Śaiva case (*antyeṣṭidīkṣā*), the officiant draws the consciousness (*jñānam*) of the deceased back into the corpse from the other world, takes it again through the initiatory process of consecration and the rest (*abhiṣekādi*) before a Maṇḍala,[296] and then sends it out through the top of the head to ascend to liberation or a pure Buddha-field such as Sukhāvatī.[297]

---

reading my remark that I had not yet seen the manuscript very kindly acquired and sent me scans of it.

[295] According to Padmaśrīmitra the ritual is to be done for Ācāryas and others who have practised the meditation-rite of Vajrasattva or some other Tantric deity; f. 15r8, v. 1: *mṛtācāryādisattvā ye vajrasattvādiyoginaḥ | vakṣ<y>e cāntasthite<ḥ> kṛtyaṃ teṣāṃ mārganidarśanāt*. It may be done for a man or a woman; f. 15r10–11, v. 9ab: *puruṣatanu<ṃ> nirūpyātha striyo vā samyag eva hi*. Śūnyasamādhivajra does not specifiy those for whom it is intended. But Jagaddarpaṇa adds a preamble to Śūnyasamādhivajra's text in which he restricts it to Vajrācāryas; f. 240v7: *adhunā parinirvṛtavajrācāryaśarīrasyānteṣṭividhir ucyate*.

[296] *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, f. 15r14, vv. 21c–22b: *tato vijñānam ānīya mantramudrānuyogataḥ || aṅkuśyādyaiḥ praveśyātha dadyāt sekādikaṃ punaḥ* 'Then having drawn down the consciousness [of the deceased] by means of the Mantras and Mudrās, and having caused it to enter [the corpse] by means of the Mudrās beginning with the Hook, he should again give it the consecrations and the rest'; *Mṛtasugatiniyojana*, f. 2r3–4: *tato nayet suraktavarṇaṃ* (conj. [Tib. *mdog dmar gsal ba*] : *suraktaṃsvadhām*) *paralokasaṃsthitaṃ jñānaṃ dharmamukhākṛti yad vā nivātaniṣkampadīpanibham | ānītaṃ taj jñānaṃ mṛtasya hṛdaye praveśayet śirasā* 'Then he should draw down the consciousness [of the deceased] that is in the world beyond, [visualizing it as] bright red in colour or with the shape of the letter A (the *dharmamukham*), resembling the unflickering flame of a lamp in a windless place. When that consciouness is nigh he should cause it to enter the heart of the deceased through [the top of] his head'. According to the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, the Ācārya should trace and worship the Maṇḍala, offer a Bali, and then place the corpse at its east gate with its head to the south; f. 15r12–13, vv. 12–13b: *same viśuddhabhūbhāge gomayenopalepite | maṇḍalaṃ catuśraṃ vai kārayet tatra saṃkiret || śuklaṃ pītaṃ rajo vāpi tatra padma*dalāṣṭakam* (conj. : *dalābhakam* Cod.); f. 15r13, vv. 18c–19: *uttarābhimukho mantrī saṃpūjya maṇḍalaṃ baliṃ || dattvārghādikaṃ caiva saṃsādhya maṇḍalaṃ kṛtī | sthāpayen maṇḍaladvāri prācyāṃ tu dakṣiṇāmukham*.

[297] In the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*'s prescription the Ācārya visualizes that the purified consciousness of the deceased is drawn out of the corpse by a multitude of rejoicing deities filling the sky and placed by them in a world such as Sukhāvatī inhabited by Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; f. 15v2–3: 28 *saṃbuddhabodhisattvādivīriṇīvīravṛndakaiḥ | siddhagandharvabhujagaiḥ surair vidyādharair api* || 29 *pūrṇaṃ nabhastalaṃ vīkṣya *nipatatpuṣpavṛṣṭikam* (*nipatat* em. : *nipatataḥ* Cod.) | *tad divyadundubhidhvānamuraja*mardaladhvani* (*mardala* conj. : *murdata* Cod.) || 30 *ucchataveṇuvīṇādimadhurasvārabhūṣaṇam | tadānandasuvistārāt kurvadbhir nṛtyam ujjvalam* || 31 *tair ākṛṣya ca vijñānaṃ sukhāvatyādikāhvaye | sthāpitaṃ lokadhātau hi buddhabuddhātmajāśraye*. The procedure of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* differs here; f. 3r1–3: *tad anu *kuśāgre* (em. [Tib. *ku sha'i rtse mo la*] : *kuśāgraṃ* Cod.) **mantrī* (em. [Tib. *sngags pas*] : *mantrai* Cod.) *vibhāvya tīkṣṇaika*sūcikaṃ vajram* (corr. : *śūcikavajraṃ* Cod.) | *nikṣipya vajrarandhre dhyāyāt tad dahanasaṃkāśam* || *tad anu samāhitacitta<s> taddhṛdi vinyastavisphuraj jñānam* | *saṃcodayej *jvaladbhir vajrāgrair mārutoddhūtaiḥ*

The Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi, the Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa, and Buddhaguhya

That this transformation of the Mahāyāna had been achieved by absorbing and adapting non-Buddhist practices was evident from the beginning. For the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, our first major Buddhist Tantra,[298] later classified as the principal work of the Caryātantra class, was conscious that it would be accused of just this:

> O [Vajrapāṇi,] Lord of the Yakṣas, in time to come there will arise people of inferior understanding and no faith who will not believe this teaching. They will dissent and have many doubts. They will hear it but they will not take it to heart and they will refuse to put it into practice. Being themselves unworthy they will bring others too to ruin. [For] they will say that this is not the teaching of the Buddhas but belongs to the outsiders.[299]

(em. [Tib. *rdo rje rtse nas rlung gis bskyod pa yi 'bar ba rnams kyis*]: *jvaladbhivajrāgraumārutoddhṛtair* Cod.) ‖ **udgacchad tad* (corr. [Tib. *de ni 'phar bar*] : *udgacchantaṃ* Cod.) *dhyāyād dahanārci<ḥ>spṛśyamānapāradavad* | **ūrdhvāgnena* (?) (Tib. *steng gi sgo nas*) *vimuktiṃ buddhakṣetraṃ viśuddhaṃ vā* 'Then the Mantrin should take a blade of Kuśa grass, visualize a sharp one-pointed Vajra at its tip, place [that tip] at the aperture of the [corpse's] penis and imagine that it is burning. Then concentrating his mind he should cause the shining consciousness that he has installed in the heart [of the corpse] to be driven [up from the heart] by blazing wind-fanned Vajra-points and he should visualize it rising to liberation or a pure Buddha-field through the upper [aperture], like [a drop of] quick silver touched by tongues of fire'. The 'upper' is one of nine apertures through which consciousness can leave the body at death (*utkrāntiḥ*). It is located at the top of the head and is called 'the golden door' (*kanakadvāram*) by Bhavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* (*Catuṣpīṭhanibandha*), f. 52r2: *ūrdhveti kanakadvāreṇa yadā gacchati tadā maraṇād ūrdhvaṃ śīghram eva gater gatyantaraṃ viśiṣṭaṃ gacchati*. The point of exit depends upon the destiny of the deceased. This is the best. According to Śūnyasamādhivajra consciousness that exits at death through this aperture goes to the Immaterial World (*ārūpyadhātuḥ*): *śirasārūpyaṃ gacchet* (f. 3r4). This idea that consciousness may leave the body through various exits in accordance with its destiny is found widely in Brahmanical sources. Early Buddhist sources speak rather of consciousness ceasing at death at these points in the body; see *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on 3.43abc. Vasubandhu says there that in the case of Arhats their consciousness disappears in the heart according to some and in the head according to others: *arhantaḥ | teṣām api hṛdaye vijñānaṃ nirudhyate | mūrdhnīty apare.*

[298] See here p. 101.

[299] *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud*, f. 177r1–3: *de la gsang ba'i bdag po ma 'ongs pa'i dus na sems can blo zhan pa ma dad pa gang dag bstan pa'i de la dad par mi 'gyur zhing yid gnyis dang som nyi mang ba | thos pa tsam snying po ma 'dzin pa | sgrub ma la mi phyogs pa dag 'byung bar 'gyur te | de dag ni bdag nyid kyang ma rung la gzhan yang phung bar byed pa yin no | 'di skad du 'di ni phyi rol pa rnams la yod de | sangs rgyas rnams kyi gsungs pa ni ma yin no zhes smra bar 'gyur gyi.*

The *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*, another early Buddhist Tantric text,[300] assigned to the lowest class of Mantranaya texts, known as the Kriyātantras, is more explicit in this regard; and it has good reason to be so since it contains in its chapters 47–49 an assimilated version of the cult of Tumburu and his four sisters, that is to say, the cult of the *vāmasrotaḥ* division of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha, describing the Mantras of these deities as the highest and most secret of all the non-Buddhist (*laukika-*) Mantras.[301] Moreover, it teaches that any of the

---

[300] The date of this text is obscure. MATSUNAGA (1985) is of the opinion that the 9th chapter, on applications of the Ekākṣaramantra, was in existence before the Chinese translations T. 1181 of A.D. 702 and T. 1182 of A.D. 703. He also informs us (*ibid.*) that the first ninety percent of the Chinese translation of the *Garuḍapaṭalaparivarta* (T. 1276), produced at some time between 746 and 774, is identical with the first sixty percent of the 41st chapter of the *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* as edited. The translation is attributed to Amoghavajra (705–774), but MATSUNAGA observes (*ibid.*) that only the first part of the common text is in keeping with his other translations, the latter part containing elements such as human hair, beef, and skull-cups, which taken together are altogether alien to his Mantranaya. He strengthens the hypothesis that only the first part of this translation is by Amoghavajra with the evidence of the *Go-shōrai mokuroku*, a catalogue of the Buddhist texts brought from China to Japan by Kūkai in 806, which lists this text as occupying three sheets, a third of the length of T. 1276. The prophetic history of Indian Buddhism, the *Rājavyākaraṇa*, chapter 53 of the published *Majuśriyamūlakalpa*, cannot be earlier that the late eighth century since it knows of the Pāla king Gopāla (r.c. 750–775) (53.628; and 53.816: *tataḥ pareṇa *bhūpālo gopālo* [em. : *bhūpālā gopālā* Ed.] *dāsajīvinaḥ | bhaviṣyati*). Since it does not mention his successor Dharmapāla it is unlikely to be later.

[301] *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*, introductory prose before 47.1: *sarvalaukikamantrāṇāṃ sārabhūtatamaṃ paramarahasyaṃ*. The position within Śaivism assigned by this text to the cult of the four sisters suggests that, though later largely eclipsed by other traditions of the Vidyāpīṭha, it was once pre-eminent; and this is also circumstantial evidence in favour of the hypothesis proposed above (p. 50) that this cult was one of the earliest, perhaps the earliest, of the esoteric Śaiva systems. There is certainly much other evidence of its early centrality. As we have seen, it was known to Dharmakīrti (here p. 50), and a 6th-century manuscript of one of its texts survives amid the otherwise Buddhist Gilgit manuscripts (here p. 50). The *Viṣṇudharmottara* shows knowledge of only two Śaiva deity-systems in its section on iconography: the Saiddhāntika and this (3, *Adhyāya* 66, teaches the iconography of Tumburu and his sisters). The Advaitin Śaṅkara in his *Gītābhāṣya* on *Bhagavadgītā* 9.25, in which it is said that those who worship the Spirits (*bhūtejyāḥ*) reach the Spirits (*bhūtāni yānti*) [when they die], glosses *bhūtāni* as *vināyakamātṛgaṇacaturbhaginyādīni* 'such as Vināyaka, the Mothers, and the Four Sisters'. On his date, probably eighth century, see HARIMOTO 2006. These deities were also incorporated in the traditions of Maṇḍalas of the *Nayasūtra* and the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* that reached the Far East in the eighth century (see SANDERSON 2001, p. 8, fn. 5). Their cult was the basis of the Śaiva ritual performed to inaugurate the kingdom of Angkor at the beginning of the ninth century (*ibid.* and 2005a, pp. 355–358); and there too, where the Mantramārga was preserved in an early form, we see only the Siddhānta of its earliest texts and this cult. This co-existence is also evident in the Śaiva liturgies of Java and Bali, which are of Saiddhāntika character but incorporate these deities (see GOUDRIAAN 1973 and

Mantra-procedures taught in the Śaiva and Gāruḍa Tantras[302] will be effective if applied by Buddhists in the Maṇḍala of these converted deities.[303] Thus the Buddhists envisaged by this text have the whole array of Śaiva Mantras at their disposal; and this position, so surprising from the conventional Buddhist standpoint, is justified by the claim that what people have come to refer to as the Śaiva, Gāruḍa, and indeed Vaiṣṇava Tantras are in fact Buddhist, since they were first taught by Mañjuśrī in this "vast Kalpa", that is to say, in the *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* or, more probably, in a hypothetical proto-text of which the actual text was thought to be an abbreviated redaction:[304]

> I have taught this Mantra [of Śiva] which together with the trident Mudrā destroys all demons, out of my desire to benefit living beings. Those living on the earth will say that its ancient Kalpa, that I taught in former times, was taught by Śiva. [But] the various excellent extensive [Kalpas] in the Śaiva Tantras are in fact my teachings.
>
> ...
>
> The extensive Kalpas that have been related in the Vaiṣṇavas Tantras were taught by Mañjughoṣa for living beings who could only be trained by [this] device.[305]
>
> ...
>
> All the extensive Kalpas taught in the Gāruḍa Tantras were taught by me in order to benefit living beings.[306]
>
> ...
>
> It was I that first taught, in this vast Kalpa, everything that the inhabitants of earth without exception refer to as the teaching of Śiva. It was only later that others taught in the various texts [considered to be taught by him] the Kalpamantras of the wise Śiva Tumburu the Trader.[307]

SANDERSON 2005a, p. 373–374, fn. 76).

[302] On the Śaiva Gāruḍatantras see here p. 46 and SLOUBER 2007.

[303] *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 47.98c–99b, 102ab, 103ab: *yāvanti śaivatantre 'smiṃ ye tantre cāpi gāruḍe* ‖ *brahmādyair ṛṣimukhyaiś ca* ...*pūjitā kalpavistārā viṣṇurudrasavāsavaiḥ* | ... *tasmin maṇḍale* **yojya* (conj. : *yojyā* Ed.) *siddhyantīha na saṃśayaḥ* 'All the extensive Kalpas that have been taught in this Śaivatantra and, moreover, in the Gāruḍa, and worshipped by Brahmā and others, by the leading Ṛṣis, ... by Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Indra, will be mastered if applied in this Maṇḍala. Of this there is no doubt.

[304] *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 2.32–34b: *eṣa mantro mayā proktaḥ sattvānāṃ hitakāmyayā* | *śūlamudrāsamāyuktaḥ sarvabhūtavināśakaḥ* ‖ 33 *yan mayā kathitaṃ pūrvaṃ kalpam asya purātanam* | *śaivam iti vakṣyante sattvā bhūtalavāsinaḥ* ‖ 34 *vividhā guṇavistārāḥ śaivatantre mayoditāḥ*.

[305] 2.31c–32b: *ya eva vaiṣṇave tantre kathitāḥ kalpavistarāḥ* ‖ *upāyavaineyasattvānāṃ mañjughoṣeṇa bhāṣitāḥ*.

[306] 2.37: *yāvantaḥ gāruḍe tantre kathitāḥ kalpavistarāḥ* | *te mayaiveditāḥ sarve sattvānāṃ hitakāraṇāt*.

[307] 47.53–54: *sarvaṃ śaivam iti khyātaṃ sarvair bhūtalavāsibhiḥ* | *mayaiva nigaditaṃ*

If this is so, then the text has disarmed criticism that the Mantra-procedures that are presented as properly Buddhist in this text bear a suspiciously close resemblance to the non-Buddhist in their liturgical morphology. For if the Omniscient has revealed all forms of religion in consideration of the differing mental dispositions of his manifold audiences, then there is no reason at all why he should not in his wisdom have taught Tantric practice for Buddhists as well as for outsiders. The strict division between the Buddhist and the non-Buddhist has dissolved within a higher Buddhist intertextual unity. Indeed this very argument is deployed by *Buddhaguhya in the late eighth century in his commentary on the passage of the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* cited above.[308] He argues that what those who attack this Tantra for containing elements proper to the non-Buddhist Tantras fail to realize is that those Tantras too were taught by the omniscient Buddha.[309] So it follows that there nothing inherently un-Buddhist in

---

pūrvaṃ kalpe-m asmiṃ savistare ‖ 54 *paścād anyo janaḥ prāhuḥ kalpamantrāṃ pṛthak pṛthak* | **tumburoḥ* (corr. : *tumburuḥ* Ed.) *sārthavāhasya tryambakasya tu* **dhīmataḥ* (corr. : *dhīmateḥ* Ed.).

[308] *Buddhaguhya's teaching in the Kriyā- and Caryā- divisions of the Tantras is said by Gzhon nu dpal (*Blue Annals*, p. 351) to have been pre-eminent in Tibet during the first transmission of Esoteric Buddhism, from the latter half of the eighth century; and this is confirmed by the Tibetan inventory of Buddhist texts in translation compiled in the Ldan dkar palace in the early ninth century. Its small section of Tantras (*gsang sngags kyi rgyud*: entries 316–328) consists of nine texts of this class together with commentaries on the last four, of which three are ascribed to our author, those on the *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatejorājakalpa*, and the *Dhyānottara*. The entry on the fourth commentary, that on the *Subāhu[paripṛcchā]*, lacks the name of its author, but it is at least probable that it was from the same hand, since no other Indian commentary on this text is known. The loss of the Sanskrit originals of these and other works of early exegesis has left us without the means of confirming that his name, rendered Sangs rgyas gsang ba in Tibetan, was indeed Buddhaguhya, as modern scholarship has generally assumed. The evidence is inconclusive. For when the name appears in Tibetan sources in transcription rather than translation we find sometimes Buddhaguhya and sometimes Buddhagupta. We see the latter in the Ldan dkar inventory (LALOU 1953, p. 326: *slob dpon Bu ddha gu pta*) and both forms are found in the colophons of the translations of his works in the Tenjur (HODGE 1994, p. 70). The Tenjur contains a letter (Tōh. 4194) in which *Buddhaguhya addresses the Tibetan emperor Khri srong lde btsan, who ruled from c. 756 until c. 797 (DOTSON 2007) and officially adopted Buddhism c. 779. From it we learn that he was invited to Tibet by Khri srong lde btsan but declined the invitation on the grounds of failing strength, sending instead his commentary on the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*.

[309] *rNam par snang mdzad mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud chen po'i 'grel*, f. 158v4–6: *de la gsang ba'i bdag po ma 'ongs pa'i dus na sems can blo zhan pa zhes pa nas* | *de dag gis sngon sems can rnams la phan par dgongs pai phyir* | *'di thams cad bstan par rab tu mi shes so zhes pai bar du lha rnams kyi kha dog gang yin pa dkyil 'khor yang de yin par gsungs pa* | *dbang po dang me'i dkyil 'khor la sogs pa ni* | *'jig rten pa'i rgyud la yod kyi* | *'jig rten las 'das pa'i rgyud* | *bya ba'i rgyud dang spyod pa'i rgyud kun las mi 'byung bas na* | *'di ni sangs rgyas gsungs*

Buddhist Tantric practice, however closely it may resemble the Śaiva; and Buddhists, therefore, once they have understood this fact, may devote themselves with full confidence to the rituals of the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*.

The Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha and the First Inroads of Śākta Śaivism: Possession, Goddesses, and the Sacralization of Sex

After the time of this text Tantric Buddhism did not, as one might expect, rest content with the degree of assimilation of Śaivism it had already achieved,

---

pa ma yin no zhes zer te | gang 'jig rten gyi | rgyud rnams kyang | sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das thams cad mkhyen pas sems can rnams so so'i dad pa dang rjes su mthun par mi shes pa zhes pa'i phyir ro zhes pa ste 'The statement that begins "O [Vajrapāṇi,] Lord of the Yakṣas, in time to come [there will arise] people of inferior understanding" refers to people who do not understand all that [the Buddha] has taught for the welfare of past beings. [The Buddha] has taught [here] that the colour of the Maṇḍalas should be the same as those of [their presiding] deities. But some will say that the Maṇḍalas of Īśvara and of fire and the rest are found in the mundane Tantras [of the outsiders] and not at all in the supramundane Tantras [of Buddhism, that is to say,] in the Kriyātantras or Caryātantras, and that therefore they were not taught by the Buddha, [doing so] because they do not understand that the Blessed omniscient Buddha, in conformity with the various faiths of living beings, also taught [these] mundane Tantras'. This doctrine that all teaching is the Buddha's, that he has taught variously in the appearance of the Buddha, Śiva, and others, is set out in the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* in a passage that survives in Sanskrit through its citation in the *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*, Vilāsavajra's eighth-century commentary on the *Nāmasaṃgīti*, on verse 42, f. 31v1–32r2: *tathā coktaṃ śrīvairocanābhisaṃbodhitantre | bhagavantas tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhāḥ sarvajñajñānaṃ prāpya tat sarvajñajñānaṃ sarvasattvebhyo vibhajya nānānayair nānābhiprāyair nānopāyanayair dharmaṃ deśayanti sma | keṣāṃ cit śrāvakayānanayaṃ keṣāṃ cit pratyekabuddhayānanayaṃ keṣāṃ cin mahāyānanayaṃ keṣāṃ cit pañcābhijñajñānanayaṃ keṣāṃ cid devopapattaye keṣāṃ cin manuṣyopapattaye yāvan mahoragayakṣarākṣasāsuragandharvagaruḍakinnarādyupapattaye dharmaṃ deśayanti sma | tatra ke cit sattvā buddhavaineyikā buddharūpeṇa paśyanti. ke cic chrāvakarūpeṇa ke cit pratyekabuddharūpeṇa ke cid bodhisattvarūpeṇa ke cin maheśvararūpeṇa ke cid brahmarūpeṇa ke cin nārāyaṇarūpeṇa paśyanti sma | ke cid vaiśravaṇarūpeṇa yāvan mahoragamanuṣyāmanuṣyarūpeṇa paśyanti sma | svakasvakair vacanodāhāraṇanayair vividheryāpatha<ṃ> vyavasthitam | tac ca sarvajñajñānam ekarasaṃ yad uta tathatāvinirmuktirasam ity āha mahāvairocana iti.* This is closely related to and probably derives from the *vaineyadharmopadeśaḥ*, the eighth *Prakaraṇa* of the second *Nirvyūha* of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (pp. 268–269). The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* likewise teaches (pp. 251–252) that Avalokiteśvara assumes all kinds of forms, including that of Śiva, in order to teach living beings in consideration of their particular dispositions. STRICKMANN informs us (1996, p. 440, n. 28) that this passage is present in the Chinese translation completed by Dharmarakṣa in A.D. 286. It is probable that it is the model of the passage in the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*. The doctrine that the non-Buddhist teachers are a device (*upāyaḥ*) of the Buddha is also taught in the fourth chapter of the *Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvaṇanirdeśasūtra*, which survives in two Chinese translations, the first by Guṇabhadra in the fifth century; see ZIMMERMANN 2000, p. 18.

working only to infuse the new liturgical system with ever more clearly Buddhist purpose and meaning. On the contrary, with the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, the next major Tantra, which was considered to be the foundational text of the Yogatantra class, which follows the Caryātantras in the ascending hierarchy of the classification of the Mantranaya, and was in existence in a shorter version by the end of the seventh century and expanded in the course of the eighth,[310] we find the beginning of a process of assimilation of Śākta Śaiva language, practices, iconography, and concepts that would become ever more comprehensive throughout the rest of the Mantranaya's creativity. Here we find for the first time the requirement that candidates enter a state of possession (*āveśaḥ*) at the time of their initiation. This feature, which is altogether alien to antecedent Buddhism, is the hallmark of initiation in the Śaiva Kaula systems, setting them apart from all others.[311] The Vajrācārya puts the candidate into a state of possession, has him cast a flower on to the Maṇḍala to determine from the section on which it falls the Mantra-deity from which he will obtain Siddhi, and then, while he is still in this state, removes his blindfold to reveal the Maṇḍala. He then consecrates him with scented water from a Mantra-empowered vase, places a Vajra in his hand, and gives him his initiation-name (*vajranāma*).[312] The immediate effects of the possession are described as follows:[313]

---

[310] See MATSUNAGA 1978, pp. xvii–xvii.

[311] See, e.g., *Tantrāloka* 29.186c–220; *Tantrālokaviveka* introducing 29.201c–202b: *samāveśaḥ sarvaśāstreṣu avigānenoktaḥ*; SANDERSON 1985, pp. 200–202; 1986, p. 169 and fn. 2; and WALLIS 2008. The centrality of possession in the Śākta Śaiva domain may derive from its Kāpālika antecedents, since the Saiddhāntika Śaivas report that the Kāpālikas [of the Atimārga] defined liberation as arising from a state of possession (*āveśaḥ*) by the qualities of the deity, analogous to the state of one who is possessed by a Bhūta (*bhūtāviṣṭapuruṣavat* [*Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* on 1.61]); see, e.g., *Pauṣkarabhāṣya*, p. 232: *svayam āviśyate siddhaḥ puruṣas tu grahair iva | itthaṃ caiva tu kāpālās tat sāmyaṃ muktim ūcire*; and *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, p. 156, ll. 22-24: *kāpālikāḥ samāveśena sāmyam upagacchanti | tathā hi yathā grahāḥ puruṣam āviśanti tatheśvaraguṇā mukteṣu āviśanti*. They are distinguished in this context from the two other Atimārgic traditions, those of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas, who defined liberation as the transference of the state of equality with Śiva in the manner in which one lamp is lit from another (*sāmyasaṃkrāntivādaḥ*), and the Lākulas, who defined it as the arising of this state (*sāmyotpattivādaḥ*); see SANDERSON 2006, pp. 179–181. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that possession by the deity as the goal of practice is a marked feature of the *Picumata* and *Yoginīsaṃcāra* of the Vidyāpīṭha, texts in which the perpetuation within the Mantramārga of the Kāpālika tradition of the Atimārga is particularly clear. Both describe the goal of their Kāpālika-style asceticism as the entry of the deity propitiated into the person of the propitiator. *Picumata* f. 101v1–3 (2.114c–117): *duścaraṃ devagandharvais tvayā cīrṇaṃ mahāvratam* || 115 *varaṃ varepsitaṃ vatsa udyataṃ tu bravīhi me | yadi tuṣṭo 'si bhagavan praviśa mama vigraham* || 116 *vaktram prasārayasveti praviśya bhagavān prabhuḥ | hṛdaye bhairavo devo guhyakā tu gale sthitāḥ* || 117 *mātaro hy aṅga-m-aṅgeṣu yoginyo sandhiṣu sthitāḥ | śākinyo romakūpeṣu pūtanādyā tathaiva ca* '[Bhairava says:] You have [now] completed the observance of the [Kāpālika] Mahāvrata, which is hard [even] for the gods and Gandharvas. Choose whatever boon you desire. Tell me without hesitation [what it is]. [The Sādhaka replies:] If you are pleased, O Lord, enter my body. Telling him to open his mouth the Lord God Bhairava enters his heart. [His principal Śaktis,] the [four] Guhyakās occupy his neck, the Mother goddesses his limbs, the Yoginīs his joints, and the Śākinīs, Pūtanās, and others the pores of his skin'; cf. f. 335r1–2 (87.126c–128b): *bhairavasya mahāmudrā mudrāsānaidhyakārikā* || 127 *prayuktā tu yadā mudrā lakṣaṇena varānane | bhāvātmakavidhānena sadyo*

> As soon as he becomes possessed supernatural knowledge arises [in him]. Through this knowledge he understands the thoughts of others; he knows all matters past, future and present; his heart becomes firm in the teachings of the Tathāgatas; all his sufferings cease; he is free from all dangers; no being can kill him; all the Tathāgatas enter-and-empower him; all Siddhis approach him; unprecedented joys arise [in him], causing spontaneous delight, pleasure, and happiness. In some these joys give rise to meditation-states, in some to [the mastery of] Dhāraṇīs, in some to the fulfilment of every hope, and in some to the state of identity with all the Tathāgatas.

---

mantro vijṛmbhati || 128 *karoti sādhakāveśaṃ japadhyānavivarjitā* 'O fair-faced one, the Mahāmudrā of Bhairava draws every Mudrā nigh. When it is employed correctly with full subjective immersion the [deity of the] Mantra immediately becomes manifest. [The Mudrā] brings about possession in the Sādhaka without [need of] Mantra-repetition or visualization'. The *Yoginīsaṃcāra* requires anyone who has gone through its initiation ceremony and then received consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*) to adopt one of three forms of ascetic observance in order to gain mastery over the Vidyā (*vidyāvratam*): the Bhairavavrata, the Cāmuṇḍāvrata, or the Triṣaṣṭikulavrata, the observance of the sixty-three families [of the Mothers], which it also calls the Kāpālavrata, i.e. the Kāpālika. At the end of the observance, we are told, the Mothers will enter his body: *dvitīyaṃ tu vrataṃ vakṣye ghoraṃ kāpālarūpiṇam* || 8.41 *śire kapālamukuṭaṃ śiramālāvibhūṣitam* | *kare kurṇau tathā pādau asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitam* || 8.42 *vāme kapālaṃ khaṭvāṅgaṃ tathā vai dakṣiṇe kare* | *śmaśāne vicaren maunī triṣaṣṭi divasāni tu* | 8.43 *vratānte tu varārohe śarīre mātaro dhruvam* | *viśante devadeveśi dadante siddhim uttamām* '[Now] I shall teach [you] a second observance, the grim Kāpālavrata. He should have a skull-crown on his head and be adorned with a garland of heads. His hands, ears, and feet should be adorned with pieces of bone. In his left hand he should hold a skull-bowl and in his right a skull-staff. He should wander in silence in a cremation ground for sixty-three days. It is certain that at the end of this observance the Mothers, O fair-hipped empress of the gods, enter his body and bestow the highest Siddhi'.

[312] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, sections 224–234.

[313] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 226: *āviṣṭamātrasya divyaṃ jñānam utpadyate | tena jñānena paracittāny avabudhyati sarvakāryāṇi cātītānāgatavartamānāni jānāti hṛdayaṃ cāsya dṛḍhībhavati sarvatathāgataśāsane sarvaduḥkhāni cāsya praṇaśyanti sarvabhayavigataś ca bhavaty avadhyaḥ sarvasattveṣu sarvatathāgatāś cādhitiṣṭhanti sarvasiddhayaś cāsyābhimukhībhavanti apūrvāṇi cāsyākāraṇaharṣaratiprītikarāṇi sukhāny utpadyante | taiḥ sukhaiḥ keṣāṃ cit samādhayo niṣpadyante keṣāṃ cid dhāraṇyaḥ keṣāṃ cit sarvāśāparipūrayo yāvat keṣāṃ cit sarvatathāgatatvam api niṣpadyata iti.*

and, after the bindfold has been removed:[314]

> As soon as he sees the Great Maṇḍala he is entered-and-empowered by all the Tathāgatas and Vajrasattva dwells in his heart. He sees various visions of orbs of light and miraculous transformations. Because he has been entered-and-empowered by all the Tathāgatas sometimes the Lord Vajradhara or the Buddha appears to him in his true form. From that time forth he attains all his goals, every desire of his mind, all Siddhis, up to the state of Vajradhara or the Tathāgatas.

Ānandagarbha gives a detailed account of the means by which the candidate is put into this state of possession in the *Sarvavajrodaya*, his manual on the rites of initiation into the Maṇḍala of this Tantra, and makes it clear that entering this state is, as in the Kaula parallel, an absolute requirement. If the candidate fails to enter it by the standard means, the Vajrācārya is to perform a rite to remove the sins that are assumed to be the cause, and if the candidate still fails to enter the possession state, he may not proceed further:[315]

> If possession does not occur, because [the candidate] has committed [too] many sins, he should proceed to destroy those sins by repeatedly making the Sin-Destruction Mudrā. With concentrated mind he should kindle a fire with sticks of sweet wood and burn all his sins by casting into it oblations of sesame seeds with the Mantra OṂ SARVAPĀPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ. He should make a simulacrum of those sins with black sesame seeds on the palm of his right hand and visualizing the [wrathful] syllable HŪṂ in the centre he should offer it into the fire with his index finger and thumb. Then he should imagine that the sin is being incinerated in his body by Vajras wrapped in flames emerging from the fire-pit. [The candidate] will definitely become possessed. If possession does not occur even so, then he must not give him the consecration.[316]

---

[314] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 231: *mahāmaṇḍale ca dṛṣṭamātre sarvatathāgatair adhiṣṭhyate vajrasattvaś cāsya hṛdaye tiṣṭhati | nānādyāni ca raśmimaṇḍaladarśanādīni prātihāryavikurvitāni paśyati | sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhitatvāt kadā cid bhagavān mahāvajradharaḥ svarūpeṇa darśanaṃ dadāti tathāgato veti | tataḥ prabhṛti sarvārthāḥ sarvamanobhirucitakāryāṇi sarvasiddhīr yāvad vajradharatvam api tathāgatatvaṃ veti.*

[315] *Sarvavajrodaya*, f. 61r4–v1 (exposures 009a and 008b): *atha pāpabahutvād āveśo na bhavati punaḥ pāpasphoṭanamudrayā tasya punaḥ punaḥ pāpāni sphoṭavyāni | samidbhir madhurair agniṃ prajvālya susamāhitaḥ | nirdahet sarvapāpāni tilahomena tasya tu ||* OṂ SARVAPĀPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ *iti | dakṣiṇahastatale kṛṣṇatilaiḥ pāpapratikṛtiṃ kṛtvā hūṃkāramadhyaṃ vicintya tarjanyaṅguṣṭhābhyāṃ homaṃ kuryāt | tato homakuṇḍān nirgatya jvālāmālākulair vajrais tasya śarīre pāpaṃ dahyamānaṃ cintayen niyatam āviśati | evam api yasyāveśo na bhavati tasyābhiṣekaṃ na kuryād iti.*

[316] Cf. *Tantrāloka* 29.29.210–211b: *athavā kasyacin naivam āveśas tad dahed imam | bahir antaś coktaśaktyā pated itthaṃ sa bhūtale || yasya tv evam api syān na tam atropalavat tyajet* 'Or, if some rare person does not become possessed by this

It is certain that the possession intended is not nominal or figurative. For Ānandagarbha tells us that once the Vajrācārya is sure that the candidate is in this state he should use him as an oracle:[317]

> Then when the Ācārya has ascertained that [the candidate] is possessed he should form the Samayamudrā of Vajrasattva and address him with [the Mantras] HE VAJRASATTVA HE VAJRARATNA HE VAJRADHARMA HE VAJRAKARMA and NṚTYA SATTVA NṚTYA VAJRA (DANCE, O SATTVA; DANCE, O VAJRA). If he is indeed possessed he will adopt the Vajrasattvamudrā. Then the Ācārya should show the Mudrā of the Vajra Fist. By this means all the deities beginning with Vajrasattva make themselves present [in him]. Then he should ask him something that he wishes [to ascertain], with the following [procedure]. He should visualize a Vajra on the tongue of the possessed and say SPEAK, O VAJRA. [The candidate] then tells him everything [that he wishes to know].[318]

---

means he should visualize him being burned both internally and externally by the Power [of the Mantra] taught above. By this means he will fall to the ground. If a person does not achieve [the state of possession] even by this means then in this [system] he must cast him aside like a stone'. Falling to the ground is commonly mentioned in Kaula texts as the consequence of initiatory possession; see, e.g., *Matasāra* f. 39v2–3: *yāvanmātraṃ vihvalaṃ ca vedhayet pāśapañjaram | pāśastobhāt pataty āśu bhūtale nātra saṃśayaḥ*; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, *bhairavānanāvidhau bhūmikāpaṭalaḥ*, f. 191v (v. 105ab): *śaktikṣobhāt tadā yogī viddho patati bhūtale*; *Devīdvyardhaśatikā* f. 16v: 197 *tatkṣaṇāt patate bhūmau chinnamūla iva drumaḥ*; *Chummāsaṃketaprakāśa*, first surviving verse: *[ta]ddṛkpātamahodayāt | bhūmau sampatitaḥ kṣiprāc chinnamūla iva drumaḥ*; *Ūrmikaulārṇava* f. 9r3: **pañcāvasthāgataḥ* (em. : *pañcāvasvagataḥ* Cod.) *sākṣāt sa viddhaḥ patate bhuvi*; f. 19v5–6 (2.230–231): *pracalanti *mahāpāśā* (corr. : *mahāpāśam* Cod.) *āveśaṃ tasya jāyate | ānando hy udbhavaḥ kampo nidrā ghūrmis tu pañcamī || tattvaviddhasya deveśi pañcāvasthā bhavanti hi | sa viddhaḥ patate bhūmau vajrapātād ivācala<ḥ>*; the Kaula *Vṛddhasvacchanda* ff. 17v24–18r2, Ed. 10.15c–17a (using this MS alone): *jñātvā śrīśaktisaṃkrāmaṃ sadevāsuramānuṣān || *vedhayen* (em. : *vedayen* Cod. Ed.) *nātra sandehaṃ pātayet parvatāny api || *sakṛtsaṃkrāmayogena* (Cod. : *cakrāt saṅkrāmayogena* Ed.) **chinnamūla* (Ed. : *chinnamūlam* Cod.) *iva drumaḥ || patanti dehinaḥ sarve*; 10.25ab, Ed. 10.25ab: *sa viddhaḥ patate bhūmau *vajrāghātād ivācalaḥ* (em. : *vajrāghātam ivācalam* Cod. Ed.).

[317] *Sarvavajrodaya*, f. 61v2–3: *tataḥ samāviṣṭaṃ jñātvācāryeṇa* HE VAJRASATTVA HE VAJRARATNA HE VAJRADHARMA HE VAJRAKARMA *iti vajrasattvasamayamudrāṃ baddhvoccāraṇīyam | punar* NṚTYA SATTVA NṚTYA VAJRA *iti | sa ced āviṣṭaḥ śrīvajrasattvamudrāṃ badhnīyāt | tadācāryeṇa *vajramuṣṭimudropadarśanīyā* (*nīyā* corr. : *nīyāḥ* Cod.) *| evaṃ sarve śrīvajrasattvādayaḥ *sānnidhyaṃ* (corr. : *sannidhyaṅ* Cod.) *kalpayanti | tato 'bhipretavastu pṛcched anena | jihvāyām *tasyāviṣṭasya* (em. : *tasyāviṣṭasyāviṣṭasya* Cod.) *vajraṃ vicintya brūhi vajra iti vaktavyam | tataḥ sarvaṃ vadati.*

[318] The inducing of possession in persons so that they may be used as oracles, is not restricted in Tantric Buddhism to the context of initiation. It is also seen as an independent procedure in which the medium is a young boy or girl. We find it in the Tantra *Subāhuparipṛcchā* in a section partly translated and partly paraphrased from the Chinese by STRICKMANN (1996, pp. 222–226), a work that was translated

---

into Chinese (T. 895) by Śubhākarasiṃha in 726 and was in the hands of the Chinese monk Wu-xing in 674 (HODGE 2003, p. 18). We also see it in the *Su ji li yan mo xi shou luo dian shuo jia lu luo a wei she fa* 'The quickly effective method of possession (*āveśaḥ*) taught by the god Maheśvara' (T. 1277). This short scriptural text, whose translation from the Sanskrit is assigned to Bukong (Amoghavajra) and to a date between 746 and 774, claims in its preamble that it is a teaching given by Śiva (Maheśvara) to Nārāyaṇa on Mt. Gandhamādana in answer to the latter's request. It sets forth a procedure to induce the messenger (Dūta) of Maheśvara to possess a young girl aged seven or eight so that he can then use her while she is in this state to answer any questions he has concerning the future. He should have her fast by eating nothing but pure foods for three or seven days. Then on an auspicious day he bathes her, anoints her with unguents, gives her clean clothes, puts camphor in her mouth, sits facing East, smears a low wooden platform with sandalwood-paste, has the girl stand on it, scatters flowers in front of her, sets up a vessel of Argha water, takes incense, empowers it seven times with the Mahāmudrāmantra, lights the incense and fumigates the girl's hands with it, takes a red flower, empowers it, places it in her hands, and passes his hands over her face. Then, with his hand forming a Mudrā he touches and thus empowers five parts of his own body and then with the same Mudrā touches the girl's head, her mouth, his heart, and his navel visualizing in these the symbols of fire, water, earth, and wind respectively. He then empowers his two legs, visualizes Garuḍa, puts the armour-Mantra on the girl's body, and visualizes himself as Maheśvara, three-eyed, with the digit of the moon on his crown, blue-faced, eighteen-armed, and brandishing various weapons, with a snake as his sacred thread, wearing the bleeding hide of an elephant. He then protects her with recitation, empowers flowers, incense, and Argha water with the Mahāmudrāmantra, and seals the ten directions. Then facing the girl the Sādhaka recites the Mantra of Maheśvara's Dūta. The girl will start to tremble. This reveals to him that the Dūta has entered her. He then snaps his fingers and recites the Mantra. If she does not fall into the possession trance he should recite a further Mantra to incite the Dūta to enter her. By this means the result is certain. He then interrogates her about good and bad in the future and is told whatever he wishes to know. This account is based on an oral translation of the Chinese text very kindly provided by my colleague NOTAKE Miyako (Leipzig). A French translation of part of the text, without the visualizations, is given in *Hōbōgirin*, p. 7.

Here too the model is Śaiva, as the preamble and content of this text suggest. Putting children into a possession-state is already present in the earliest literature of the Śaiva Mantramārga, where we find the use of Kṣatriya and brahmin boys for this purpose; see *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* f. 82v1–2 (*Niśvāsaguhya* 10.116–117b): *athāveśaṃ kartukā[maḥ] + + kṣatrakumārakam | snāpayitvā tam ekaṃ tu śuddhadehaḥ savāsakam || pūrvāmukhaṃ sthāpayitvā hy udakenāveśayet*; f. 112v6 (*Niśvāsaguhya* 17.30): *athāveśaṃ kartukāmo brāhmaṇakumāra[kam + u]dakena snāpya tenaiva tāḍyamānam āveśayed vācayā mokṣaḥ*. The ritual also appears in narrative literature. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* (70.55–63) tells a story of an ash-smeared ascetic, a pupil of Śuddhakīrti, who has mastered many Mantras and claims to have done this with a Kṣatriya boy (56cd: *śubhalakṣaṇam āsādya kaṃcit kṣatrakumārakam*), who in his trance revealed the whereabouts of many miraculous herbs and elixirs (57: *sa kumāraḥ samāviṣṭaḥ pṛṣṭo nānāvidhāṇi me | siddhauṣadhirasakṣetrāṇy udīryedam athābravīt*), and, finally, a palace of the Nāgas in a pollen-covered pond in the jungles of the Vindhya mountains, where, with the help of Vīras, he could obtain a sword that would make him lord of the Siddhas. The procedure is referred to there as a *svasthāveśaḥ* 'a [rite of caus-

Nor is possession restricted in the *Sarvatathāgatasaṃgraha* to the context of initiation. The term *āveśaḥ* is used repeatedly in the text to denote the state that

---

ing oracular] possession in one who is healthy (*svasthaḥ*) [in body and mind]' (70.56ab: *so 'haṃ kadāpy akaravaṃ svasthāveśaṃ prasaṅgataḥ*), and it appears under this name frequently in the Vidyāpīṭha, where in accordance with that literature's Śākta character the medium is, as in the *Su ji li yan mo xi shou luo dian shuo jia lu luo a wei she fa*, a young girl. We see this in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 2, f. 19r9–v3 (6.54c–59): *kanyāṃ sulakṣaṇopetāṃ dhūtavāsāṃ manoharām* || 55 *svalaṃkṛtām ataḥ kṛtvā rātrāv eva maheśvari* | *dattvā dhūpaṃ tato vidyām āvart'ye<t> sādhakeśvaraḥ* || 56 *tāvad āvartayed ghorāṃ yāvad āveśam āpnuyāt* | *divyabhaumāntarikṣ*ādyam* (conj. : *ādyā* Cod.) *āveśaṃ kurute kṣaṇāt* || 57 *hastārdhaṃ ca kṣitiṃ tyaktvā tiṣṭhate vikṛtānanā* | *tadā mahālipiśitais tarpayet suravandite* || 58 *prahvaś ca praṇato bhūtvā pṛcchet sādhakasattamaḥ* | *sadāśivādikṣityante yāvan manasi rocate* || 59 *tat sarvaṃ kathayed devi yad anyaṃ vā hṛdi sthitam* | *evaṃ pṛṣṭvā visarjeta praṇamya parameśvari* 'Then, at night, O Maheśvarī, the lord among Sādhakas should adorn a pretty young girl endowed with excellent characteristics and wearing freshly washed clothes, fumigate her with incense, and then begin to repeat [the Vidyā of] Ghorā. He should continue to repeat it until she becomes possessed. Immediately [her understanding] penetrates all that is in the heavens, on the earth, and in the sky. With her face contorted she hovers half a cubit above the ground. Then, O honoured by the gods, he should gratify her with offerings of wine and meat. He should then bow low before her and put his questions to her. O goddess, she will tell him all that he wishes to know in the whole universe, from the level of Sadāśiva down to Earth, and other matters that are concealed in his heart. When he has interrogated her in this way, O Parameśvarī, he should prostrate himself in veneration and allow her to leave'; and *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 99v2–6 (14.70–76)· *atha sādhayituṃ vāñche<t> svasthāveśanam uttamam* | *tadā kanyāṃ samānīya sarvalakṣaṇalakṣitām* || 71 *āsane tāṃ pratiṣṭhāpya sugupte varamandire* | *raktakṛṣṇāmbaradharāṃ raktasrakkaṇṭhaśobhitām* || 72 *śubhāsanasthāṃ tāṃ kuryāt palāliparipūritām* | *avyucchinnaṃ dahed dhūpaṃ vidyām āvartayet tataḥ* || 73 *tadā sā kampate kanyā ghūrṇate hasate punaḥ* | *ghaṇṭāṃ pravādayet tatra mahāmantra*vidhau* (conj. : *vikai* Cod.) *sthitaḥ* || 74 *tata āviśate tūrṇaṃ devadevī kṛśodarī* | *tyaktvā bhūmiṃ tiṣṭhate sā tadā **sa* (corr. : *sā* Cod.) *praṇataḥ pumān* || 75 *tarpayet parameśānīṃ nānābalyopahārataḥ* | *tadā sādhakamukhyāya vadate **manasepsitam* (corr. : *manasīpsitam* Cod.) || 76 *bhūtaṃ bhavyaṃ bhaviṣyaṃ ca kālatrayam athākhilam* | *brahmāṇḍodaragā vārtā<ḥ> sādhakāya vadaty asau* 'If he desires to accomplish the supreme rite of *svasthāveśaḥ* he should bring a young girl who possesses all the necessary characteristics and set her on a seat in an excellent building that is well concealed. Her seat should be of fine quality. She should be dressed in a dark red garment; her neck should be adorned with a garland of red flowers; and her mouth should be filled with wine and meat. He should burn incense without interruption and then repeat the Vidyā again and again. Then the girl begins to tremble, swoon, and laugh. Established in the procedure of the Great Mantra he should ring his bell. The emaciated Goddess will immediately enter [the girl], who will then rise and hover above the ground. The Sādhaka should then prostrate himself before her and gratify the Goddess with the offering of a various Balis. Then [speaking through the girl] she will tell that excellent Sādhaka whatever he desires to know. She will explain to him [anything he wishes to ascertain in] the three times, past, present, and future], all events within the entire sphere of Brahmā'.

the practioner must induce in himself in order to accomplish both his Siddhis and his enlightenment, typically in the compound *vajrāveśaḥ* 'possession by Vajra'. For example:

> For by means of possession by [Vajra]sattva enlightenment will quickly be attained.[319]
>
> ...
>
> When he has given rise to *āveśaḥ* in this way whatever form he meditates on as his own will automatically become Buddha in form.[320]
>
> ...
>
> When *vajrāveśaḥ* has arisen he should visualize the water as an embodiment of the Vajra. Quickly achieving success he will be able to walk on [that] water.[321]
>
> ...
>
> Once he has generated *vajrāveśaḥ*, if with concentrated mind he makes a slight clap with his palms in the Vajrāñjali [gesture] he can subject to his control even a mountain.[322]
>
> ...
>
> Likewise, by virtue of the practice of *āveśaḥ*, if he stretches out [his hands in] the Vajra gesture and strikes together the tips of his fingers he can kill a hundred families.[323]

Two other features of this seminal text evidence the influence of Śākta Śaivism. The first is the fact that after teaching the Vajradhātumaṇḍala in its opening section it goes on to teach the Vajraguhyamaṇḍala, in which the five Tathāgatas are replaced by goddesses: Vairocana at the centre by Vajradhātvīśvarī and, around her in the four directions, Akṣobhya by Vajravajriṇī, Ratnasambhava by Ratnavajriṇī, Amitāyus by Dharmavajriṇī, and Amoghasiddhi by Karmavajriṇī.[324] In the preamble Vajrapāṇi makes the following joyous declaration (*udānam*):[325]

> Ah, how benevolent is the Bodhicitta to all beings! For the Buddhas take on even female form to accord with [the expectations of] their disciples (*vineyavaśāt*).

---

[319] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 167: *yat sattvāveśayogād dhi kṣipraṃ bodhir avāpyata iti.*

[320] Section 238: *tathaivāveśam utpādya yad rūpaṃ svayam ātmanaḥ* | **bhāvayen* (em. : *bhāvayan* Ed.) *bhavate tat tu buddharūpam api svayam.*

[321] Section 238: *vajrāveśe samutpanne vajrabimbamayaṃ jalam* | *bhāvayet kṣiprasiddhas tu jalasyopari caṅkramet.*

[322] Section 247: *vajrāveśaṃ samutpādya tālaṃ dadyāt samāhitaḥ* | *vajrāñjalitalaiḥ sūkṣmaṃ parvato 'pi vaśaṃ nayet.*

[323] Section 247: *tathaivāveśavidhinā vajrabandhe* (conj. : *bandha* Ed.) *prasārite* | *agrāṅgulisamāsphoṭād dhanet kulaśataṃ kṣaṇāt.*

[324] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, sections 319–327.

[325] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 322: *aho hi bodhicittasya sarvasattvahitaiṣitā* | *yad vineyavaśād vīrāḥ strīrūpaṃ api kurvate.*

The second is the incorporation of sexual intercourse into the activities of worship as a higher form of practice. This element is not conspicuous because it is not mentioned in the treatments of the principal Maṇḍalas taught in the text and it was therefore easily pushed out of view when this text was propagated in China and thence in Japan. It is present nonetheless as an esoteric teaching reiterated many times throughout the text in the form of passages teaching that the pleasure of sexual union and indeed other sensual delights are a means both of worshipping the Buddha and of attaining Siddhis when combined with meditation on one's Buddha nature. For example:

> 1: If after generating a firm intention to attain enlightenment he meditates on himself as the Buddha and worships himself [as the Buddha] with the pleasure of sexual intercourse he will obtain the joys of the Buddha himself.
>
> ...
>
> 2: He will quickly become equal to Vajrasattva if he presents the pleasures of embracing the body of any [woman] as offerings to the Buddhas. He will be become equal to Vajraratna if he presents the pleasures of grasping [her] hair in intensely felt love as offerings to the Buddhas. He will become equal to Vajradharma if he presents the exquisite pleasures of kissing while immersed in intense sensual delight as offerings to the Buddhas. He will become the equal of Vajrakarma if during his worship he completely offers up to the Buddhas the pleasures of the union of the two sex organs.
>
> ...
>
> 3: He will attain success in the Maṇḍala by means of the union of the two sex organs while meditating with fully concentrated mind on the meditation state that embodies all things.
>
> ...
>
> 4: Non-detachment from sensual pleasures: this is the greatest and purest rule of discipline [for an initiate] in the family of the Tathāgatas. It may not be transgressed even by the Buddhas.
>
> ...
>
> 5: There is no religious duty purer than [the exercise of] sexual desire, the bestower of all joys. This, which brings about Siddhi, is the highest duty in the family of the Tathāgatas.
>
> ...
>
> 6: During worship with the four prostrations he will quickly attain Siddhi if when exhausted from the exertion of love-making he offers [to the Buddhas] the pleasure which that love-making aroused.
>
> ...
>
> 7: He will attain Siddhi if while meditating with in-turned mind on the purity of lust he worships the Buddhas with the drops of his semen.[326]

---

[326] 1 Section 288: *bodhicittadṛḍhotpādād buddho 'ham iti cintayan | ratyā tu pūja-*

The Guhyasamāja: copulating deities, sexual initiation rites, and the sacralization of impurity

In the next phase of the Mantranaya, seen in the *Guhyasamāja*, also a product of the eighth century, this esoteric eroticism has moved to the foreground; and this is apparent from the very beginning of the text. For the place where the Buddha is said to have been residing at the time that he revealed this Tantra, which was expected to be stated in the preamble (*nidānavākyam*) of any scripture claiming to be Buddhist, is not one of the familiar sites of revelation such as Rājagṛha, Dhānyakaṭaka, or, as in the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, the Akaniṣṭha heaven, but the vaginas of the goddesses Locanā, Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsinī, and Tārā, that is to say, a timeless, unlocated bliss:[327]

> [I aver that] I once heard the following [teaching]. The Venerable Lord was residing in the vaginas of the Vajra-women of the body, speech, and mind of all the Tathāgatas ...

and this surprising relocation, no doubt provocatively shocking in its time, became standard in the subsequent literature of the Mantranaya, both in texts closely related to the *Guhyasamāja* and in the next wave of texts, the Yoginītantras, in which the influence of the Śākta Śaiva tradition became much more intense and pervasive.[328]

---

yann ātmā labhed buddhasukhāny api; 2 Sections 549–553: *sarvakāyapariṣvaṅgasukhapūjāḥ svayaṃbhuvām | niryātayan bhavec chīghraṃ vajrasattvasamo hi saḥ || dṛḍhānurāgasaṃyogakacagrahasukhāni tu | niryātayaṃs tu buddhānāṃ vajraratnasamo bhavet || dṛḍhaprītisukhāsakticumbitāgryasukhāni tu | niryātayaṃs tu buddhānāṃ vajradharmasamo bhavet || dvayendriyasamāpattiyogasaukhyāni sarvataḥ | niryātayaṃs tu pūjāyāṃ vajrakarmasamo bhaved iti*; 3 Section 1825: *viśvarūpasamādhiṃ tu bhāvayan susamāhitaḥ | dvayendriyasamāpattyā maṇḍale tu sa sidhyati*; 4 Section 2168: *kāmānām avirāgas tu samayaḥ sumahān ayam | tathāgatakule śuddho nātikramyo jinair api*; 5 Section 2175: *rāgāc chuddhataro nāsti dharmaḥ sarvasukhapradaḥ | tathāgatakule 'py eṣa dharmaḥ siddhikaraḥ paraḥ*; 6 Section 2506: *surataśramakhinnas tu tat saukhyaṃ suratodbhavam | catuḥpraṇāmapūjāyāṃ niryātya laghu sidhyati*; and 7 Section 2651: *antargatena manasā kāmaśuddhiṃ tu bhāvayan | svaretobindubhir buddhān pūjayan siddhim āpnuyāt*. Other passages advocating sexual intercourse in worship are to be found in sections 475–479, 525–529, 929–932, 1184, 1790–1792, 1918–21, 2071–2074, 2158–2159, 2177, 2360–2363, 2415–2416, 2419–2421, 2425, 2439, 2443, 2445, 2504, 2508, 2510, 2512, 2516, 2672, 2720, 2950, and 2951.

[327] *Guhyasamāja*, preamble: *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye | bhagavān sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittahṛdayavajrayoṣidbhageṣu vijahāra*.

[328] This same formula, or a variant, is seen in the *Vajramālā* (*rDo rje phreng ba*), f. 208r2–3: *bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi sku dang gsung dang thugs kyi sning po rdo rje btsun mo'i bha ga rnams la* (as in the *Guhyasamāja*]), the *Kṛṣṇayamāri* (*sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittasarvavajrayoṣidbhageṣu*), and in those of the Yoginītantras that have a *nidānavākyam*: the *Hevajra* and *Saṃpuṭodbhava* (both as in the *Guhyasamāja*), the *Vajrāmṛta* (f. 1v1: *sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittahṛdayavajrāmṛtaguhyapadmeṣu*), *Vajrārali* (*rDo rje ā ra li*, f. 171r2–3: *de*

In the *Guhyasamāja* the male deities, now multi-faced and multi-armed in a fusion of Śaiva and Buddhist iconography, are represented and visualized copulating with their consorts;[329] and both initiation and subsequent practice now involve copulation with a female partner, as in the Śāktism of the Śaivas.[330] A further borrowing from the Vidyāpīṭha is evident in the introduction of a crucial element of what that tradition calls 'non-dualistic practice' (*advaitācāraḥ*) and both traditions call 'practice free of inhibition' (*niḥśaṅkācāraḥ*), namely the offering to the deities of such 'impure' substances as urine, faeces, semen, and blood, and their sacramental consumption.[331]

---

bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i bha ga la [**sarvatathāgataprajñāpāramitābhage*]), *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* (*sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittahṛdayavajradhātvīśvarībhage*), *Abhidhānottara* (f. 1v3: *sarvatathāgatavajrakrodhaḍākaḍākinīguhyahṛdayeṣu*), *Saṃvarodaya* (*sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittavajrayoginībhageṣu*), and *Ḍākārṇava* (f. 1v1: *mahāvīreśvarasarvatathāgatavīrakāyavākcittayoginībhageṣu*).

[329] This is the case in both of the major Maṇḍalas based on this Tantra, that of saffron-coloured Vajrasattva-Mañjuvajra and that of black Akṣobhya. For the full iconography of these pantheons see *Niṣpannayogāvalī* A, pp. 1–7; B, pp. 1–12. The principal difference between them is that in the Akṣobhyamaṇḍala only Akṣobhya, the central deity (*cakreśvaraḥ*) and the ten wrathful Krodharājas that form the outer protective circle are represented embracing consorts (*sasvābhaprajñāḥ*), whereas in the Mañjuvajramaṇḍala this is also the case with the four Tathāgatas (Vairocana, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi) that occupy the four directions around the central deity. All the deities in both Maṇḍalas are three-faced and six-armed and all except the Krodharājas, who stand in the aggressive Pratyālīḍha posture, are seated in the Vajraparyaṅka posture. None of the deities has any of the Kāpālika attributes that mark the iconography of the Yoginītantras, namely the skull-bowl, skull-staff, bone-ornaments, and coating of ash.

[330] The *Guhyasamāja* proper (chapters 1–17) gives little detail in its account of initiation and makes no mention of the involvement of a consort, speaking of the necessity of acquiring such a partner only in the context of the post-initiatory practice known as the *vidyāvratam*; see 16.93: *ṣoḍaśābdikāṃ gṛhya sarvālaṅkārabhūṣitām | cāruvaktrāṃ viśālākṣīṃ prāpya vidyāvrataṃ caret* 'After obtaining a girl of sixteen with a charming face and wide eyes, adorned with every adornment, he should practice the Vidyāvrata [with her]'. The supplementary 18th chapter, however, the *Samājottara*, gives an account of the initiation involving copulation in its vv. 113–127.

[331] See, e.g., *Guhyasamāja* 4.21: *viṇmūtraśukraraktādīn devatānāṃ nivedayet | evaṃ tuṣyanti saṃbuddhā bodhisattvā mahāśayāḥ* 'He should offer to the deities such things as urine, faeces, semen, and blood. In this way the noble Buddhas [and] Bodhisattvas are gratified' (cf. the following in the *Guhyasamāja*'s satellite Tantra *Vajrahṛdayālaṃkāra*, Paṭala 3 [*rDo rje snying po rgyan gyi rgyud* f. 39v3–4]: *bshang gci khu ba khrag rnams ni | dung chen po ru bzhag byas te | lha rnams la ni dbul bar bya* 'He should place faeces, urine, semen, and blood in a human skull [*mahāśaṅkhe*] and offer them to the deities'); 6.21: *viṇmūtrāhārakṛtyārthaṃ kuryāt siddhiphalārthinaḥ | sidhyate 'nuttaraṃ tattvaṃ bodhicittam anāvilam* 'If he desires to attain Siddhi he should consume faeces and urine. [By this means] he will master the ultimate reality, the spotless Bodhicitta'; 7.33ab: *samayāt kṣared retaṃ tu vidhinā pibet phalakāṅkṣiṇaḥ* 'In accordance with the rule of the discipline he should ejac-

---

ulate his semen and drink it if he desires to attain his goal'; 12.47cd: *pañcāmṛtaprayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnuyāt* 'By the use of the Five Nectars he will attain Vajrasattva-hood'; 16.7ab: *avaśyam eva dātavyaṃ viṇmūtrādyaṃ viśeṣataḥ* 'One must especially offer [to the Maṇḍala] such substances as faeces and urine'; 17.47: *viṇmūtraśukraraktānāṃ jugupsāṃ naiva kārayet | bhakṣayed vidhinā nityam idaṃ guhyaṃ trivajrajam* 'He must not feel disgust at faeces, urine, semen, and blood. He must regularly consume [them] according to the rite. [For] this is secret of the three Vajras [of body, speech, and mind]'; 18.67c–68b: *siṃhavad vicaren mantrī nirviśaṅkena cetasā | nākāryaṃ vidyate hy atra nābhakṣyaṃ vidyate tathā* 'He should wander [fearlessly] like a lion, with a mind free of inhibition. For him there is nothing that he may not do, nothing that he may not eat'. On *advaitācāraḥ/niḥśaṅkācāraḥ* and the use of such substances, the Five Nectars (*pañcāmṛtam*), in the rites of the Śākta Śaivas see SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 110–113, fn. 63; and, e.g., Vimalaprabodha, *Kālīkulakramārcana*, f. 65r3–v4: *atha nityanaimittikakāmyārcane kuladravyagaṇaṃ likhyate | palāṇḍuṃ laśunaṃ gṛñjaṃ lambuṣaṃ lavatarkasam | vāmāpuṣpaṃ puṣpabandham aṣṭau dravyāṇi kaulike || śivāmbu surā raktamadyaṃ mahātailaṃ ca śīdhukam | kuṇḍagolodbhavaṃ śukraṃ peyāny aṣṭau kulāgame || matsyaṃ māṃsaṃ mahāgotthaṃ sthalajākāśanīrajam | mahāmāṃsaṃ mṛgaṃ caiva bhakṣyāṇy aṣṭau kulakrame || mātaṅgī kajjalī śauṇḍī kaṇḍukī carmiṇī dhvajā | chippī veśyā susaṃbaddhā grāhyaitāḥ kālikākule || niḥśaṅkācāramārgeṇa pūjanaṃ ca bhaved yadi | tadāsau sidhyate *devī* (em. *devi* Cod.) *tair *bhuktvā bhāvitā yadi* (conj. : *bhuktaṃ bhāvitaṃ yadi* Cod.) *|| tatpānasparśanāhārāt pāśacchedakarī smṛtā | *gopitaṃ* (conj. : *gopitais* Cod.) *tan mayā pūrvam advaitācāraśobhanam*. Cf. in the Mantranaya, e.g., the *Sarvadevasamāgamatantra* (lost in Sanskrit, apart from citations, and not translated into Tibetan) quoted in the *Tattvasiddhi* of Śāntarakṣita, A f. 96v3–6, B f. 39v11–13 (Tib. f. 30r5–7): **nirvikalpena bhāvena* (em. [Tib. *rnam par mi rtog sems kyis ni*] : *nirviśaṅkena bhāvena* AB) *sarvakarmāṇi sarvadā | *ācaren* (conj. : *ācāran* B : *ācāra* A [Tib. *spyod pa*]) *nirviśaṅkena tapasām *uttamottamam* (em. [Tib. *mchog gi mchog*] : *uttamaṃstapaḥ* B : *uttamātcpa* A) *|| *viṣayān sevamānasya* (em. [Tib. *yul rnams *bsten* (corr. : *bston* Cod.) *par gyur pa na*] : *viśayāṅgavimānasya* AB) *nirvikalpena cetasā | *kutsādhikaṃ na vā cet tat* (tentative conj. [cf. Tib. *smod par gyur pas mi gnod pa*] : *kutsādhikaṃ na vā cetas* B : *kutsādhikanaceta* A) *tat tapo *duratikramam* (corr. : *duratikramaḥ* AB) *|| yas tu sarvāṇi karmāṇi *prajñayā* (em. [Tib. *shes rab kyis*] : *prajñāyā* B : *prajñāyāyā* A) *viniyojayet | *sā ca śūnyapade yojyā* (em. [Tib. *de yang stong pa'i gnas su sbyar*] : *sarvāḥ śūnyapade yojya* B : *sarvaśūnyapade yojya* A) **tapo* (em. [Tib. *dka' thub*] : *tathā* AB) *hy eṣa mahātmanām || *prajñāsaṃkrāntirūpeṇa* (B [Tib. *shes rab 'pho ba ngos pos ni*] : *prajñāsaṃkrātirūpana* A) *nirvikalpena cetasā | *niḥśaṅkācārasaṃcāras* (em. [Tib. *dgos pa med par kun spyod*] : *niḥsaṅkānārasañcāraḥs* AB) **tapas teṣāṃ* (B [Tib. *de'i dka' thub yin*] : *tapatapateṣāṃ* A) *mahātmanām*. A version of this passage is contained in the *Vajraḍāka*, f. 3v2–4 (1.57c–62b): *sopāya<ṃ> sarvakarmāṇi nirviśaṅkaś cared yadā || 1.58 nirvikalpena bhāvena vratānām uttamotta*mam* (em. : *maḥ* Cod.) *| nirvikalpena bhāvena sarvakarmāṇi sarvadā || 1.59 ācare<n> nirviśaṅkena tat teṣām *uttamaṃ tapaḥ* (conj. : *uttamāttataḥ* Cod.) *| viṣayān *sevamānasya* (em. : *sevyamānayo* Cod.) *nirviśaṅkena cetasā || 1.60 *keśoṇḍukānubhāvena* (em. : *keśoṇḍukasvabhāvena* Cod.) *tat *tapo* (em. : *tayo* Cod.) *duratikra*mam* (corr. : *maḥ* Cod.) *| yas tu sarvāṇi karmāṇi prajñayā viniyojayet || 1.61 sā ca śūnyapade yojyā tapo hy etat mahātmanām || prajñā*saṃkrāntarūpāṇāṃ* (conj. : *saṃkāśarūpāṇi* Cod.) *nirvikalpena cetasā || 1.62 niḥśaṅkācāra*saṃcāras* (corr. : *saṃcāraḥs* Cod.) *tapas teṣāṃ *mahātmanām* (corr.

That Tantric Buddhists possessed the specialized knowledge of the Śaiva Mantramārga that would enable them to draw at will on the Śaiva Tantras in this period is placed beyond doubt by an early exegetical work in the tradition of the *Guhyasamāja*. For this, the *Guhyasiddhi* of Padmavajra, written in all probability in the eighth century,[332] assumes that any initiate in the practice of this Tantra is not only familiar with the Śaiva scriptures but is able to enact their rituals by assuming the role of a Śaiva Guru, implying thereby that such initiates were typically converts from the Mantramārga with experience both of its texts and of its practices. For it tells the adept of this tradition that in order to acquire the female consort required for his post-initiatory observance he should enter the home of a family of untouchables who are observant devotees of Śiva, reveal to them one of the Saiddhāntika scriptures—the text specifically mentions the *Kālottara* and the *Niśvāsa*—give them Maṇḍala initiation [following this scripture], and then return to them the *dakṣiṇā* that they will give him, taking a girl from them in its place:[333]

> He should wander in other lands, in which he is known nowhere. With firm resolve the Sādhaka should enter among untouchables who are devotees of Śiva and recognize no other deity as absolute, who are inspired by the Siddhānta, always attached to [the rituals of] bathing and deity-worship, and dedicated to the doctrines of its scriptures through some slight degree of literacy. After entering among them in the guise of an untouchable votary (*caṇḍālagaṇaḥ*), he should, while cultivating insight into the highest wisdom, instruct them in the religion of the Siddhānta established in such scriptures as the *Kālottara*, or the *Niśvāsa*;[334] and in order to win their trust he should take as his disciples all those who are enjoined by the Tantra after [initiating them before] the Initiation Maṇḍala [of Śiva]. Then he should give back to them all the goods and money that they will previously have gathered and given him as their offering to their Guru and take [instead] a girl of theirs with a beautiful face and eyes. After acquainting her with the essence of the Mantras and making her adhere to the rules of an initiate that wise one should practice the Vidyā observance [with her], after resolving to become a Buddha.[335]

This is indeed troubling evidence for those who may be reluctant to accept that Buddhists would have had the familiarity with Tantric Śaivism that my thesis of the development of the Mantranaya presupposes.

The Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara: Heruka and his Yoginīs, Kāpālika iconography, the Gaṇamaṇḍala, and the beginning of Śaiva-Buddhist intertextuality

With the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, another product of this century,[336] we see the beginning of the final phase of śāktization. It is still rooted in the liturgical tradition of the Yogatantras,[337] as can be seen in the

---

: *mahātmanaḥ* Cod.).

[332] Portions of the *Guhyasiddhi* have been quoted in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* of Āryadeva: *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, pp. 71–72 (*imam evārthaṃ dyotayann āha śrīguhyasiddhau:*) = *Guhyasiddhi* 3.71–81, 17.38; p. 77 = 6.2–3; and p. 97 = 6.45–49. TOMABECHI (2008, p. 175) has shown that Āryadeva's work is likely to have been written in the early years of the ninth century.

[333] *Guhyasiddhi* 8.8c–16b: *paryaṭed* **anyadeśeṣu* (conj. [cf. 8.2cd: *praviśya cānyadeśeṣu*] : *divyadeśeṣu* Ed. [Tib. *bzang po'i yul du 'khyam par bya*]) *yatra na jñāyate kvacit* ‖ 9 *praviśya *cāntyajātīnāṃ madhye* (em. [Tib. *mthar skyes nang du 'jug par bya*] : *cāntyajādīnāṃ madhye* Ed.) *ye tripurāntake* | *bhaktā jānanti naivānyaṃ daivataṃ paramārthataḥ* ‖ 10 **siddhāntabhāvitā nityaṃ* (em. [Tib. *rtag tu rang gi grub mtha' bsgom* (**svasiddhāntabhāvakā nityaṃ*)] : *siddhyante bhāvitā nityaṃ* Ed.) *snānadevārcane ratāḥ* | *kiṃcidakṣaramārgeṇa *prasaktāḥ* (conj. : *prasakte* Ed.) *śāstradarśane* ‖ 11 *evaṃ praviśya tanmadhye sādhako dṛḍhaniścayaḥ* | *caṇḍālagaṇarūpeṇa bhāvayan bodhim uttamām* ‖ 12 **darśayec ca tatas teṣāṃ dharmaṃ siddhāntapūrvakam* (em. [cf. Tib. *chos dang grub mtha' sngon 'gro ba* | *de nas de la ston par byed*] : *darśayec ca tatas teṣāṃ dharmasiddhāntapūrvakam* Ed.) | *kālottarādi*saṃsiddhaṃ* (em. : *saṃśuddhaṃ* Ed.) *no cen niḥśvāsasaṃbhavam* ‖ 13 *pātayituṃ ca viśvāse sarvāṃs tāṃs tantracoditān* | *kṛtvā caivātmanaḥ śiṣyān dīkṣāmaṇḍalapūrvakam* ‖ 14 *tato yat saṃcitaṃ dravyaṃ tair dattaṃ gurupūjane* | *tat teṣām arpayitvā tu pūrvaṃ vittena saṃyutam* ‖ 15 *gṛhītvā kanyakāṃ teṣāṃ cāruvaktrāṃ sulocanām* | *tāṃ kṛtvā mantrasadbhāvābhijñāṃ samayasaṃmatām* ‖ 16 *cared vidyāvrataṃ dhīmān buddhatvakṛtaniścayaḥ*. I have emended *antyajādīnām* to *antyajātīnām* with the support of the Tibetan because the *-ādi-* is inapposite: in 8.7 the Sādhaka is told to enter the home of an untouchable (*antyajālayaḥ*); and in 8.1 he is told that it is an untouchable girl (*antyajā*) that he is to acquire. I take *dharmaṃ siddhāntapūrvakaṃ* in 8.12c to mean '*dharmaṃ* preceded by [the word] *siddhānta-*', i.e. *siddhāntadharmaṃ*, an example of a not uncommon style of periphrasis.

[334] Literally "that which has arisen from the outbreath (*niḥśvāsaḥ/niśvāsaḥ*) [of Śiva]". Both forms of the name of this scripture, *Niśvāsa* and *Niḥśvāsa*, are attested.

[335] Padmavajra is elaborating on *Guhyasamāja* 16.93: *ṣoḍaśābdikāṃ gṛhya sarvālaṅkārabhūṣitām* | *cāruvaktrāṃ viśālākṣīṃ prāpya vidyāvrataṃ caret* 'He should take a girl of sixteen with a beautiful face and wide eyes, adorned with every ornament, and practice the Vidyā observance with her'.

[336] It was translated into Tibetan towards the end of the eighth century or early in the ninth, and Amoghavajra (705–774) names it and provides a brief summary of its teachings in his *Jin-gang-ding-jing yu-jia shi-ba-hui zhi-gui*, Jap. *Kongō-chō-gyō yuga jūhatte shiiki* (T. 869) *Key Points of the Eighteen Assemblies of the Yoga of the Vajraśekharasūtra*; see TOMABECHI 2007, p. 905. He composed this work in Chinese at some time between 746 and and his death in 774, but we can be sure that the text existed in some form, perhaps in an early stage of its development, by c. 740, since his knowledge of it must have been gained between 741 and 746, when he was in Ceylon and perhaps India gathering the Tantric literature whose analysis and translation into Chinese occupied the rest of his life.

[337] It is referred to by Āryadeva as a Mahāyogatantra in his *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, p. 82: *adhunā prapañcatācaryā śrīsarvabuddhasamāgamayogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara-mahāyogatantrād avatāryate*. This term serves to distinguish it from the Yogatantras, namely the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* and its satellites and to

---

group it with the *Guhyasamāja* and related texts, though which of the Yogatantras in the broad sense qualified to be considered Mahāyogatantras might be the subject of divergence of opinion. Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna defines this class (*rnal 'byor chen po'i rgyud*) as comprising the *Guhyasamāja* and its explanatory Tantras (*vyākhyātantrāṇi*), which he lists as the *Guhyendutilaka*, the *Kṛṣṇayamāri*, the *Paramādya*, the *Sarvadevasamāgama*, the *Sarvarahasya*, the *Vinayāmogha[siddhi]*, the *Vajrajñānasamuccaya*, the *Vairocanamāyājāla*, the *Laghukhasama*, the *Advaya[samatā]vijaya*, and the *Vajraśekhara* (*Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma dka' 'grel*, p. 286: *de la rnal 'byor chen po'i rgyud ni dpal gsang ba 'dus par bshad rgyud dang bcas pa dang zla gsang thig le dang gshin rje'i gshed nag po dang mchog dang po dang lha thams cad 'dus pa dang thams cad gsang ba dang 'dul ba don yod pa dang ye shes rdo kun las btus pa dang rnam par snang mdzad sgyu 'phrul dang nam mkha' dang mnyam pa chung ngu dang gnyis med pa rnam par rgyal ba'i rgyud dang rdo rje gtsug tor rgyud la sogs pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis te rgyas par byas na grangs pa med do.*) An alternative terminology distinguishes these more esoteric Yogatantras as Yogottaratantras, perhaps originally in the meaning 'Supplementary Tantras (*uttaratantrāṇi*) of the Yoga [class]', and refers to the Yoginītantras as Yoganiruttaratantras, giving the ascending series Kriyātantra, Caryātantra, Yogatantra, Yogottaratantra, and Yoginiruttaratantra; see, e.g., Rāmapāla, *Sekanirdeśapañjikā*, introducing verse 1, describing his teacher Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) as an unsurpassed master of all of these: *iha mahāpaṇḍitāvadhūtaśrīmaitreyanāthaḥ kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoganiruttaratantreṣv anuttaraguruḥ*; Ratnākaraśānti, *Muktāvalī*, p. 223, on *Hevajra* 2.8.10: *sarvam iti pañcavidham: kriyācaryāyoga*yogottarayoganiruttarabhedena* (*yogottara* corr. [=Cod., f. 45v6] : *yogāntara* Ed.); Kāṇha, *Yogaratnamālā*, p. 156 (on *Hevajra* 2.8.10): *sarvamantranayam iti pañcavidhaṃ kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoganiruttarabhedena*; Advayavajra, *Gūḍhapadā*, f. 6r6–7: *vajraṃ pañcajñānātmakaṃ | iha pañcajñānaśabdena kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoga*niruttarāṇi* (em. : *niruttarāś ca* Cod.) *tantrāṇy ucyante*. I have seen no occurrence in any Indian source of the term *Anuttarayoga, commonly encountered in secondary sources. It is evidently an incorrect modern translation into Sanskrit of the ambiguous Tibetan rendering of Yoganiruttara (*rnal 'byor bla na med*). Early authors attest a less developed hierarchy. Vilāsavajra, an author of the eighth century (TRIBE 1994, pp. 9–23) and the Guru of Buddhajñānapada according to Gzhon nu dpal (*Blue Annals*, p. 367), says that he writes his *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* after studying the Pāramitānaya and the Kriyā-, Caryā-, and Yogatantras (A f. 1v1–2: *yogacaryākriyātantraṃ tathā pāramitānayam ... vilokya*), but the last evidently includes texts such as the *Guhyasamāja*, *Vajrabhairava*, and *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*, since he quotes these and other related works. *Buddhaguhya (*rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud chen po'i 'grel*, ff. 64v7–65r6) speaks of Kriyātantras, which emphasize external ritual practice (*phyi'i spyod*, *bāhyacaryā*), giving as examples the *Susiddhikara* and the *Vidyādharapiṭaka*, and Yogatantras, which emphasize internal meditation (*nang gi sbyor*, *adhyātmayogaḥ*), giving the example of the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, and says that the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, later classified as a Caryātantra, is a Yogatantra in as much as it emphasizes the practice of Method and Wisdom (*thabs dang shes rab gtsor gyur sbyor ba'i rgyud*), but may also be referred to as a Kriyātantra or as an Ubhayatantra (*bya ba'i rgyud dam gnyis ka'i rgyud*), that is to say, as a Tantra of both (*ubhaya-*) classes, because it also teaches external practice for the benefit of those whose commitment is to this. In a parallel treatment in his *Piṇḍārtha* commentary on the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* he gives the *Vajrapāṇyabhiṣeka* among examples of Kriyātantras (see the translation in HODGE 2003, p. 449). This too was later

use of that tradition's system of the four types of Mudrā (Mahāmudrā, Samayamudrā, Dharmamudrā, and Karmamudrā) in Sādhana texts based on this Tantra, such as the *Vajrajvālodayā* of Ānandagarbha and the *Herukasādhana* of Kalyāṇagarbha.[338] But it initiates a new direction that would be followed in the next and final phase of the Mantranaya's development, that of the Yoginītantras.[339]

---

considered to be a Caryātantra. The terms Kriyātantra and Yogatantra are semantically coherent, as Buddhaguhya indicates. But the choice of the term Caryātantra ('Observance Tantra') for the intermediate class is puzzling. It is conceivable that it was adopted artificially under the influence of the classification of the subject matter of the Tantras of the Śaiva Mantramārga into *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yogaḥ*, and *jñānam* or *vidyā*, perhaps with the notion that the fourth corresponds to the Pāramitānaya.

[338] As far as I am aware, only one other Sādhana text of this Heruka has survived in Sanskrit. This is the anonymous *Herukasādhana* of *Sādhanamālā* 241. Ānandagarbha's, which appears not to have been translated into Tibetan, is much the most detailed of the three. Apart from these works the only other evidence of this cult in surviving Sanskrit sources of which I am aware is in the eclectic Yoginītantra *Saṃpuṭodbhava*, which in f. 80v5–81v2, in its eighth Kalpa, the *Sarvakriyāsamudayakalparāja*, includes the Mantras of this Heruka and his retinue of goddesses. There is also a chapter in the *Abhidhānottara* of the Cakrasaṃvara corpus (B ff. 121v5–129v1: Paṭala 22) which teaches a hybrid pantheon in which the goddesses of this Heruka's retinue have been incorporated into that of Heruka and Vajravārāhī, the former taking on the appearance of the Heruka of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*, being four-faced and eight-armed. This poverty of surviving sources in Sanskrit is probably due to the eclipse of this Tantra after the propagation of the later Yoginītantras, both in India and in Tibet. A striking indication of this eclipse is the fact that its Maṇḍala was not included by Abhayākaragupta in his *Vajrāvalī* and *Niṣpannayogāvalī* in the first quarter of the eleventh century. For the position that the four Mudrās are the distinctive fundamentals of the Sādhana system of the Yogatantras see, e.g., Mkhas Grub rje's *rGyud spyi*, pp. 228–248.

[339] It was accordingly classified in the Kanjur (Tōh. 366–367) among the Yoginītantras (Tōh. 360–441). Likewise, Mkhas grub rje (1385–1438) in his *rGyud spyi*, p. 266: *bde mchog kye rdor dus 'khor sgyu thod gdan *bzhi* (em. : *gsum* Ed.) *phyag chen thig le sangs rgyas mnyam sbyor sogs ma rgyud yin no* 'The Mother Tantras [=Yoginītantras] are such as the *Śaṃvara*, the *Hevajra*, the *Kālacakra*, the [*Mahā*]*māyā*, the [*Buddha*]*kapāla*, the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Mahāmudrātilaka*, and the [*Sarva*]*buddhasamāyoga*'. This recognition of the [proto-]Yoginītantric character of the text is not only Tibetan. It appears in the thirteenth chapter of the *Ḍākinīvajrapañjara*, where it is referred to in abbreviated form as the **Sarvabuddha-* (*Sangs rgyas kun*) in a list of Yoginītantras that also includes the *Vajraḍāka*, *Hevajra*, *Guhyakośa*, *Vajrāmṛta*, and *Cakrasaṃvara*: *rdo rje mkha' 'gro phan rgyud dang | *kye yi rdo rje* (T : *kye yi rdo rje dkyil 'khor* D) *sangs rgyas kun | gsang mdzod rdo rje bdud rtsi 'byung ba dang | 'khor lo sdom pa gur *gyi* (T : *dang* D) *'byung gnas ni | rnal 'byor ma *rgyud ni* (T : *rgyud drug tu* D) *rab tu grags* (*mKha' 'gro ma'i dra ba'i rdo rje gur rgyud*, D f. 104v4–5; T p. 369, ll. 5–6), and in Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna's commentary on his *Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka' 'grel*, where he refers to the texts of this class under their alternative title as Yoganiruttaratantras (*rnal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud*), p. 286: *rnal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud ni dpal nam mkha' dang mnyam pa 'bum pa chen po 'khor lo sdom pa dang rdo rje mkha' 'gro dang rdo rje gdan bzhi pa dang ma hā mā yā dang sangs rgyas mnyam sbyor*

First, it introduces or brings to the fore the cult of the deity Heruka[340] with an iconography inspired by that of the Bhairavas of the Vidyāpīṭha with their accoutrements and attributes of the cremation-ground dwelling Kāpālika Śaiva ascetic. According to the visualization given by Ānandagarbha he has four faces and eight arms, emerging as the transformation of a dark blue flaming Vajra, itself a transformation of a dark blue syllable HRĪḤ. The central face is fierce (*raudram*), those to its right and left expressive of delusion and erotic passion, and that behind open-mouthed to devour. In his two uppermost hands he holds the freshly flayed skin of Bhairava over his back, in the two below a bow and arrows, in the third right in descent he shakes a blazing three-pronged Vajra, and in the fourth a skull-bowl filled with human blood (*mahāraktam*). In the third left in descent he brandishes the Kāpālika's skull-staff (*khaṭvāṅgaḥ*), topped with a three-pronged Vajra and adorned with bells, and in the fourth a skull-bowl filled with human flesh (*mahāmāṃsam*). Or he may be single-faced and two-armed, with a five-pronged Vajra in his right hand raised above his shoulder and a skull-bowl full of human flesh in his left, with a skull-staff resting on his left shoulder and held in the crook of his left arm. He wears a chaplet of skulls with the Buddha [Akṣobhya] adorning his flaming hair, is surrounded by an aureole of flames, poses with his left foot on the ground and his right leg raised so that the sole of the foot touches his left thigh, has dancing eye-brows knitted in anger, and has round, fire-red darting eyes.[341] Kalyāṇagarbha, who teaches only the two-armed form, adds that he stands on a sun disc, which rests on a lotus, which rests in turn on a prostrate corpse, is smeared with ashes, wears a garland of freshly severed human heads, and has protruding fangs.[342] An anonymous Sādhana text,

---

dang sangs rgyas thod pa dang dgyes pa'i rdo rje bum phrag lnga pa la sogs pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis bzhugs te rgyas par bya ba na grangs med do 'The Yoganiruttaratantra, endless in its full extent, contains 12,000 [texts], principally the *Mahākhasama* in 100,000 [verses], the *Cakrasaṃvara*, the *Vajraḍāka*, the *Vajracatuṣpīṭha*, the *Mahāmāyā*, the [*Sarva*]*buddhasamāyoga*, the *Buddhakapāla*, and the *Hevajra* in 500,000 verses'. On the term Yoganiruttara see here p. 146.

[340] The origin of the name Heruka has not been explained in a satisfactory manner. Indigenous sources explain it only through artificial semantic analyses based on superficial similarities of sound. Thus, for example, we are told that 'He-' means 'uncaused' (*hetuvarjitam*), '-ru-' means 'formless' (*rūpanirmuktam*), and '-ka' means 'free of sense-faculties' (*karaṇojjhitam*); see Vajrapāṇi, *Laghutantraṭīkā*, p. 45; Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 5; and the Tibetans, who translated names if they were meaningful, either left this untranslated or substituted a description, namely Khrag 'thung 'Blood-drinker', a meaning that cannot be justified etymologically. So if the name was meaningful at some stage it appears that that meaning has left no trace in the surviving literature. The alternative is that it never was meaningful in this sense, being created on the basis of the unmeaning syllables HE HE RU RU KAṂ that are found in Cakrasaṃvara's Mūlamantra: OṂ ŚRĪVAJRA HE HE RU RU KAṂ HŪṂ HŪṂ PHAṬ ḌĀKINĪJĀLAŚAṂVARAṂ SVĀHĀ. Against this it may be said that the name appears without this doubling of the first two syllables in the earlier *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 794, in the Mantra for the taming of all the Mother goddesses: OṂ HERUKA VAJRASAMAYA SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAÑJAKA HŪṂ PHAṬ. It might seem more reasonable, then, to see HE HE RU RU KAṂ as a spell-element built from an already existing name. However, it is striking that we find almost the same element in the Vidyā of Parāpārā, an important Mantra of the Śākta Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha: OṂ AGHORE HRĪḤ PARAMAGHORE HUṂ GHORARŪPE HAḤ GHORAMUKHI BHĪMA BHĪṢAṆE VAMA PIBA HE RU RU RA RA PHAṬ HUṂ HAḤ PHAṬ (*Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 3.23–39; *Mālinīvijayottara* 3.42–50; *Tantrāloka* 30.20–24b; *Triśirobhairava* quoted by Jayaratha thereon) and its variant taught in *Kubjikāmata* 18.4-24: AIṂ AGHORE HRĪṂ HSAḤ PARAMAGHORE HŪṂ GHORARŪPE HSAUṂ GHORAMUKHI BHĪMA BHĪṢAṆE VAMA VAMA PIBA HAḤ HE RU RU RA RA HRĪṂ HŪṂ PHAṬ. We may note that the name Hevajra, that of the second major deity of the Yoginītantras, appears to have a similar origin, having been conjured up from the Mantra HE VAJRA PAŚYA 'O Vajra[-being], behold!' that is uttered when the blindfold is removed from the candidate's eyes in the presence of the Maṇḍala (*Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 230). The origin of the Herukas Rigi-ārali and Vajra-ārali of the Tantras of those names are also, it seems, the apparently unmeaning syllables of Mantras: OṂ ĀRALI RIGI PHEṂ PHEṂ PHEṂ BHYO SVĀHĀ (*Ri gi ā ra li'i rgyud* f. 187v2) and OṂ VAJRA ĀRALI PHAṬ ... PHEṂ PHEṂ SVĀHĀ (*Ri gi ā ra li'i rgyud* f. 187v7). The name of the Heruka Buddhakapāla of the Tantra of that name has likewise been conjured out of the feminine vocative BUDDHAKAPĀLINI/-KĀPĀLINI that appears in its Mantras; see (*Niṣpannayogāvalī*, p. 31: OṂ BUDDHAKAPĀLINI ĀḤ HĪ HAI HŪṂ PHAṬ; *Buddhakapālatantra*, e.g., f. 5r1: OṂ BUDDHAKĀPĀLINĪ MAṬA 2 ĀḤ PHAṬ SVĀHĀ *puṣpanivedanamantraḥ*).

[341] *Vajrajvālodayā*, f. 172v1–2: *bhagavato mahāmudrāṃ baddhvā purata ākāśadeśe* HRĪ<Ḥ>*kāreṇa viśvapadmaṃ niṣpādya tasyopari pañcasūcikaṃ jvālāvajraṃ* HŪṂ A *iti* | *tato vajrāhaṃkāra<ṃ> bhāvayet* JVĀLĀVAJRO 'HAṂ HŪM *iti* | *tatas tad vajraṃ śrīherukam ātmānaṃ bhāvayet* ŚRĪHERUKO 'HAM HŪM *iti*; f. 173r4–v4: *caturmukham aṣṭabhujam* | *tatra prathamaṃ mukhaṃ raudraṃ dakṣiṇa<ṃ> dvitīya<ṃ> mukhaṃ pramoha*pramodina<ṃ>* (?) *pṛṣṭhatas tṛtīyakaṃ bhakṣaṇamukhaṃ vāmataś caturthaṃ śṛṅgāramukham* | *etac ca mukha*catuṣṭayaṃ* (conj. ISAACSON : *catuṣṭaya* Cod.) *gītyā nirdiṣṭam iti* | *dvābhyāṃ bhujābhyāṃ vāyupaṭadhāraṇayogena sārdrabhairavacarmadharaṃ dvābhyāṃ dhanurbāṇadharaṃ dakṣiṇatṛtīyena triśūcikajvālāvajrollālanatatparaṃ caturthena mahāraktaparipūrṇakapāladharaṃ vāmatṛtīye ghaṇṭāsahitavajrakhaṭvāṅgadharaṃ caturthena mahāmāṃsaparipūrṇakapāla*dharaṃ* (corr. : *dharaḥ* Cod.) | *dvibhujam ekamukhaṃ <vā> vāmaskandhe yajñopavītayogena ghaṇṭāvajrakhaṭvāṅgaśobhitaṃ dakṣiṇakareṇa *tripatākāyuktena* (corr. : *tripatāka* Cod.) *pañcaśūcijvālāvajradharaṃ* | *vāmakareṇa mahāmāṃsaparipūrṇakapāladharaṃ* | *kapālamālāmakuṭabuddhacūḍāmaṇi<m> uccaviśvapadmāsanopaviṣṭaṃ vāmapādaṃ bhūmisthaṃ kṛtvā dakṣiṇapāda<ṃ> sattvaparyaṅkayogena nyasya* | *tatpādatalaṃ vāmoruṇā saṃpuṭīkaraṇayogenāvasthāpya nīlajvālāvajramayaṃ raktajvālābhamaṇḍalaṃ mahāpralayakālograśmaśānāgnisadṛśaṃ dīptakeśaṃ raudrādirasasaṃyogavicitramukhavibhramaṃ* | *savibhramabhrūbhṛkuṭi<ṃ> pradīptālokanartitadṛṣṭim iti.*

[342] Kalyāṇagarbha, *Herukasādhana*, pp. 470–471: *adhomukhasya śavasyopari viśvapadmaṃ tasyopari sūryamaṇḍalaṃ tanmadhye samupaviṣṭam *ekāsyordhvabhujadvayam* (*ekāsyo* em. : *ekasyo* Ed.) *iti vacanād ardhaparyaṅkinaṃ bhasmoddhūlita<ṃ> raktaprabhāmālinaṃ piṅgalordhvakeśaṃ ...sārdranaramastakamālākṛtasragdāmaṃ daṃṣṭrākarālavadanaṃ caladvartulākāraraktākṣaṃ savibhramabhrukuṭinam.*

which also teaches only that form, gives the further details that he is dark blue and clad in a garment of human skin, that his garland of heads is strung together with human entrails, that he is adorned with human bones, that is to say with the Kāpālika ornaments known as the Mudrās, and that his posture indicates that he is dancing.[343]

He is surrounded in the style of the Vidyāpīṭha by twenty Vajraḍākinīs:[344] first, in the innermost circuit the eight Gaurī, Caurī, Pramohā, Vetālī, Pukkasī, Caṇḍālī, Ghasmarī, and Herukasaṃniveśā/Herukasaṃnibhā; then the four Cāpadhāriṇī, Khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī, Cakradhāriṇī, and Citrapatākādhāriṇī; then four offering goddesses: Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, and Gandhā; and finally four theriocephalic gate-guardians: Turaṅgamā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmakī, and Bhasmapralayavetālī.[345]

---

[343] *Sādhanamālā* no. 241: *tato hrīḥkāraniṣpannaṃ nīlakarālavajraṃ hrīḥkārādhiṣṭhitavaraṭake dhyātvā tatsarvapariṇataṃ nīlaṃ naracarmabhṛtaṃ kapālamālākṣobhyaśiraskaṃ jvaladūrdhvapiṅgalakeśaṃ raktavartulākṣam antrasaṃgrathitamuṇḍamālāvalambitaṃ narāsthiracitābharaṇaṃ dvibhujaikamukhaṃ daṃṣṭrākarālavadanaṃ ... viśvapadmasūrye vāmapādaṃ tasyaivorau dakṣiṇacaraṇaṃ vinyasya nṛtyaṃ kurvantaṃ herukavīraṃ bhāvayet.* There are numerous two-armed Herukas conforming to the iconographical prescriptions of these Sādhanas in surviving statuary from eastern India, though this connection with the tradition of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* has not been recognized to my knowledge. For examples from Ratnagiri in Orissa, Nālandā, Sārnāth, and Subhapur (in the Comilla District of Bengal) see LINROTHE 1999, pp. 249–260, figs. 175–183, and 185–188, and HUNTINGTON 1984, fig. 215. The last lacks the prostrate corpse.

[344] *Vajrajvālodayā*, f. 176r7–v1: *sarvaṃ śrīgauryādivajraḍākinīgaṇaṃ nirmāya prajvalitordhvakeśaṃ | raktajvālābhamaṇḍalaṃ mahāpralayakālograśmaśānāgnisadṛśaṃ saṃkruddham ekakapālaikabuddhamakuṭaṃ svacihnadharaṃ yathāsthāne niveśayet.*

[345] The *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* deploys a complex six-family Maṇḍala consisting of six sub-Maṇḍalas. The six families, each with its own sub-Maṇḍala, are those Vajrasattva, Vairocana, Heruka, Padmanarteśvara, Vajrasūrya, and Paramāśva. Two Maṇḍala traditions deploy this pantheon. In one Vajrasattva occupies the central sub-Maṇḍala and in the other Heruka. In each sub-Maṇḍala one of these six occupies the centre surrounded by twenty goddesses. The last twelve goddesses are the same in each, namely Śuṣirā, Nṛtyā/Vīṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā, followed by Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, Gandhā, Turagā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmakī, and Bhasmapralayavetālī, the first eight of these being, as their names reveal, offering-goddesses (*pūjādevyaḥ*), personifications of offerings, and the last four gate-guardians, except that in the retinue of Heruka Cāpadhāriṇī, Khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī, Cakradhāriṇī, and Citrapatākādhāriṇī are substituted for the first four, the musical offering-goddesses Śuṣirā, Nṛtyā/Vīṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā. The first eight of the twenty, then, stand apart as the retinue specific to each Tathāgata. The eight from Gaurī to Herukasaṃniveśā formed the basis of the retinue of Hevajra in the Yoginītantra *Hevajra*, with the difference that there we see Śabarī rather than Pramohā and Ḍombī rather than Herukasaṃniveśā. See TOMABECHI 2007, pp. 919–921 for a complete tabulation of all one hundred and twenty-six deities and their seed-syllables as given in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* and the *Paramādya*. See also TANAKA 1996, pp. 199–201 for the Tibetan names of all the goddesses (and their Mantras) in the six sub-Maṇḍalas, and the listings of the names and positions of all the deities of the two six-family Maṇḍalas in BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSHO 1991, pp. 106–113. In the Heruka-centred Maṇḍala set out there each of the six deities presiding over the sub-Maṇḍalas has a consort: Heruka + Īśvarī, Vairocana + Locanā, Vajrasūrya + Māmakī, Padmanarteśvara + Pāṇḍaravāsinī, Paramāśva + Tārā, and Vajradhara + Śaṃvarī; and the total of deities is 135, since two extra goddesses, counted as one, Citrapadmā and Citravajrā, are found in front of the central deity in the sub-Maṇḍala of Paramāśva, and there are eight additional deities in the outer enclosure, since there too there are four offering goddesses within its corners and four animal-headed goddesses guarding its gateways. Theriocephalic female gate-guardians are a common feature in the Maṇḍalas of the Yoginītantras; see, e.g., *Saṃvarodaya* 13.29c–31b; Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 113 on 2.8 (Kākāsyā, Ulūkāsyā, Śvānāsyā, Sūkarāsyā); *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, p. 15 (Hayāsyā, Sūkarāsyā, Śvānāsyā, and Siṃhāsyā in the 17-deity Maṇḍala of Hevajra) and p. 90 (Sūkarāsyā, Gṛdhrāsyā, Jambukāsyā, Garuḍāsyā, Vyāghrāsyā, Ulūkāsyā in the Maṇḍala of Kālacakra).

According to Ānandagarbha[346] Gaurī (E) is fair in colour and tranquil-faced.

---

[346] *Vajrajvālodayā*, ff. 177r4–178r5: *pūrvadigbhāge* ***gaurī*** *gauravarṇā śāntadṛṣṭiḥ saumyamukhā yaugapadyenaiva tīkṣṇadhanurbāṇaparikṣepān mahāprasahyaśira<ś>catuṣṭayaṃ pātayantī pratyālīḍhasthānasthā | dakṣiṇe* ***caurī*** *raktavarṇā raudradṛṣṭimukhā yajñopavītayogena vāmaskandhe khaṭvāṅgaṃ dhārayantī | kapālamālāmukuṭā vāmakrodhamuṣṭinā hṛdy aṅkuśadhāriṇī dakṣiṇakareṇa madhyāṅgulyāṣṭāracakram utkarṣayantī vāmapādena trailokyaṃ laṅghayantī | paścime* ***pramohā*** *ādivarāhamukhā pramohadṛṣṭiḥ kṛṣṇā caturbhujā madyapūrṇakapālavāmakarā dakṣiṇakare vajradhāriṇī punar vāmadakṣiṇabhujābhyāṃ *parasparābaddhābhyāṃ* (corr. : *paramparābaddhābhyāṃ* Cod.) *pṛthivyuddharaṇaṃ kurvanty ālīḍhapadāvasthitā | uttare* ***vetālī*** *sitavarṇāṃ harṣamukhīṃ mṛtakotthāpanadṛṣṭiḥ dakṣiṇakareṇa candrakāntābhakapālacaṣakenāmṛtavāridhārāṃ pātayantīṃ vāmakareṇa vajrapatākākaradhāriṇīṃ yatheṣṭapadāvasthitā | tasminn eva maṇḍale pūrva*koṣṭhe* (corr. : *koṣṭha* Cod.) ***pukkasī*** *viśvavarṇā nṛtyamukhī nṛtyadṛṣṭiḥ dakṣiṇavajramuṣṭinā pañcasūcikajvālāvajradhāriṇī | vāmakareṇa mārutoddhūtakalpavṛkṣalatādhāriṇī kapālamālādiparipūrṇasadhūmaśmaśānamadhye nṛtyaprayogena | dakṣiṇe* ***caṇḍālī*** *nīlavarṇā vātamaṇḍalikārūḍhā savibhramamukhī ūrdhvadṛṣṭiḥ dakṣiṇamuṣṭinā vajraśūlam ādāya | vāyupaṭadhāraṇena vātamaṇḍalikāpramokṣeṇa sādhya*praṇāmādayo patantī* (?) *| paścime* ***ghasmarī*** *kṛṣṇa*varṇā* (corr. *varṇṇāṃ* Cod.) *mṛtacarvaṇamukhī bhakṣaṇadṛṣṭiḥ | vāmakareṇa vajrajvālāgnikuṇḍadhāriṇī | dakṣiṇe vajramuṣṭinā khaḍgam ādāya pratyālīḍhapadāvasthitā | uttare* ***śrīherukarūpasaṃnibhā*** *vāmakareṇa *caṣakakapālam* (*caṣaka* conj. : *capāśa* Cod.) *ādāya vāmaskandhe khaṭvāṅgaṃ dhārayantī | dakṣiṇe tripatākākareṇa pañcasūcikajvālāvajram ādāya śrīherukapade dvibhujaikamukhī saṃsthitā | āgneyakoṣṭhake* ****cāpadhāriṇī*** (em. : *copodhāriṇī* Cod.) *| raktavarṇā vāmakareṇa vajradhanur ādāya dakṣiṇena *vajracāpasahitena* (corr. : *vajracāpāsahitena* Cod.) *dhanu<r>guṇākarṣaṇayogena *vajrabāṇān* (corr. : *vajrabārṇṇān* Cod.) *kṣipantī | nairṛte* ***khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī*** *kapālamālāmakuṭabuddhacūḍāmaṇi<r> *dṛṣitāra* (?) *bhasmaśubhravarṇā dakṣiṇakareṇa ca pañcasūcikajvālāvajra<ṃ> pāṇyā kṣipantī | *vāyavye* (em. : *vāyave krodhamuṣṭinā tarjanitatparā | vāyavye* Cod.) ****cakradhāriṇī*** (corr. : *cakradhārī* Cod.) *gauraharitavarṇā vāmakrodhamuṣṭinā tarjanatatparā *dakṣiṇakaramadhyamāṅgulyāṣṭāracakram* (*dakṣiṇa* corr. : *dakṣiṇe* Cod.) *utkarṣayantī | aiśāne koṇe* ***citrapatākādhāriṇī*** *| *kanakopalavarṇā* (*varṇā*

Eight-armed, she cuts off each of the four heads of Brahmā by simultaneously firing arrows from four bows.[347] Caurī (S) is red and fierce-faced. Wearing a chaplet of skulls she holds a goad-hook (*aṅkuśaḥ*) in her left hand at her heart with a skull-staff in the crook of her left arm resting on her left shoulder, and holds aloft an eight-spoked discuss with the middle finger of her right, pressing down on the three worlds with her left foot. Pramohā (W) is black and four-armed, with the face of Viṣṇu's boar-incarnation (*ādivarāhamukhā*). In her first left hand she holds a skull-bowl full of wine and in her first right a Vajra. With her other two hands she imitates the boar-incarnation by raising up the earth.[348] Vetālī (N) is white and joyful-faced. With her right hand she pours a stream of the nectar of immortality from a transparent skull-cup and with her left shows the Vajra banner gesture. Pukkasī [E] is multi-coloured (*viśvavarṇā*) and dancing in a smoky cremation-ground full of strings of skulls and the like. In her right fist she clasps a five-pronged Vajra and in her left a wind-buffetted tendril from the wish-granting tree of paradise (*kalpavṛkṣalatā*). Caṇḍālī (S) is dark blue and riding on a whirlwind (*vātamaṇḍalikā*). In her right fist she clenches a Vajra-topped trident and with her left releases a whirlwind against her victims. Ghasmarī (W) is black and eating a corpse. In her left hand she holds a blazing sacrificial fire-vessel (*agnikuṇḍa-*) and with her right grasps a sword. Herukasaṃnibhā (N), black like Heruka, holds a skull-cup [to her heart] in her left hand, with a skull-staff resting on her left shoulder, and a five-pronged Vajra in her right. Cāpadhāriṇī (SE) is red and, holding a Vajra bow with her left hand, fires Vajra arrows by drawing back the bowstring with her right. Khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī (SW) is ash-white, wearing a chaplet of skulls and the Buddha on her crown, [holding a skull-staff with her left hand and] hurling a blazing fire-pronged Vajra from

---

conj. : *varṇṇa* Cod.) *dakṣiṇakareṇa *saṃghaṭa(?)vicitravarṇapatākā<ṃ> dhārayantī*.

[347] That Gaurī is eight-armed is not stated by Ānandagarbha, but she could not draw four bows simultaneously with fewer and no other hands are mentioned. His *mahāprasahya-* is obscure but evidently it denotes Brahmā since the victim is said here to have four heads (*mahāprasahyaśira<ś>catuṣṭayaṃ pātayantī*). Both these inferences are supported by Hūṃkāravajra, who is explicit in both regards in his **Herukasādhana* (f. 203v2): *zhal bzhi phyag brgyad brjid pa'i stongs | g.yon brkyang gar gyis bzhugs mdzad cing | mda' bzhi dus gcig bkang ba la | tshangs pa'i mgo bzhi spyangs pa ste.*

[348] According to Hūṃkāravajra's *Herukasādhana* she has two heads, that of a boar above and a red head below. Moreover, he has her raise with her two lower hands a wheel (*'khor lo*) rather than the earth (f. 203v3–5): **pra* (em. : *bra* Cod.) *mo dbu gnyis gong ma phag | 'og ma dmar po phyag bzhi pa | g.yas kyi dang pos rdo rje rtse gsum bsnams | g.yon gyi dang pos kham phor 'chang | 'og gnyis khu tshur so sor 'chang | 'khor lo 'dzin cing bteg pa'i tshul | g.yas brkyang stabs bcas nub phyogs su | rmongs tshul mdog dmar pa dma la.*

her right. Cakradhāriṇī (NW) is light green and holds aloft an eight-spoked discuss on the middle finger of her right hand and threatens [the wicked] with her left fist clenched in anger. Citrapatākādhāriṇī (NE) is golden in colour, holding a multi-coloured banner in her right hand.The four offering-goddesses stand in the directions holding the offerings that they personify: flowers, an incense-burner, a lamp, and fragrant powder; and the four goddesses Turaṅgamā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmakī/Ālokā, and Bhasmapralayavetālī stand in the four gates of the enclosure to subjugate all hostile deities (*krodhakulam*), with the heads of a horse, a boar, a crow, and a dog, and holding a hook, noose, chain, and bell.[349]

All this, barring a few specifically Buddhist details such as the Vajras and the offering-goddesses, who are already in the Mantranaya of the *Sarva-*

---

[349] Ānandagarbha's text is corrupt and lacunose at this point in the manuscript, omitting Vajramukhī and Vajramāmakī (f. 178r5–v2): *vāmamuṣṭinā ?ghaṭy?āvasthitā ?tṛy?āmāñjalinā puṣpadhūpadīpagandhacihnadhāriṇyaḥ aśvagojāsābhūtisaṃjñitāsattapūjādevī | pūrvadvāramadhye turaṅgāsanā vāmahastena padmahastā hayagrīvaharitam aśvamukhaṃ dhārayantī | dakṣiṇe kare sthitena vajrāṅkuśena sarvakrodhakulam ākarṣayantī | paścime *dvāra ālokāṃ* (corr. : *dvāre lokāñ* Cod.) *candrasūryamaṇḍala?rū?payuktavajra*sphoṭanena* (conj. : *sphoṭanaṃ* Cod.) *sarvaṃ krodhakulaṃ bandhayantī | uttaradvāre bhasmapralayavetālī *vāmakareṇa* (corr. : *nāmaḥkareṇa* Cod.) *kapālamadhye viśvavajrasthaṃ buddhabimbaṃ dhārayet | dakṣiṇe kare sthitavajraghaṇṭāvādanayogena sarvakrodhakulaṃ vaśīkurvanty *avasthitā* (corr. : *avasthitāḥ* Cod.) | **sarvāś caitāḥ* (corr. : *sarvvañcetāḥ* Cod.) *pratyālīḍhasthānasthā<ḥ> sadṛṣṭibhāvarasānvitā<ḥ>*. A complete but less detailed description of these eight can be seen in the Tibetan translation of the **Herukasādhana* of Hūṃkāravajra, f. 204r4–7. The identity of the non-human heads of the gate-guardians is mentioned in these sources only in the case of the horse-headed Turaṅgamā, by Ānandagarbha and Hūṃkāravajra (f. 204r5: *shar sgo rta mgrin 'phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu*), and Vajramukhī, by Hūṃkāravajra, who names this goddess Phag gdong 'Boar-face' (Sūkarāsyā) (f. 204r6: *lhor sgor phag gdong snon mo ste | g.yas pas mche ba g.yon zhags 'dzin*). According to the tradition of the Ngor Maṇḍalas, the last two door-guardians, Snang ba ma (Ālokā) and Thal byed ma (*Bhasmakāriṇī [?]), are crow-faced and dog-faced (BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSHO 1991, p. 110). These animal-headed guardians exemplify the character of this Tantra as transitional between the Yogatantras and the Yoginītantras. The animal-headedness is shared with such goddesses in the latter (see here p. 151), but the hand-attributes, namely the hook, noose, chain, and bell, are those of Vajrāṅkuśa, Vajrapāśa, Vajrasphoṭa, and Vajrāveśa, the male gate-guardians of the Vajradhātumaṇḍala of the Yogatantra *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*; see TANAKA 1996, p. 271. For those attributes see the **Herukasādhana* of Hūṃkāravajra, f. 204r5–7 (I have restored the Mantras, which invoke the goddesses as the personifications of these attributes, to their correct Sanskrit form): OṂ *VAJRĀṄKUŚE (corr. BA DZRA AṂ KU SHA Cod.) JAḤ | *shar sgo rta mgrin 'phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu* | OṂ VAJRAPĀŚE HŪṂ | *lhor sgor phag gdong sngon mo ste | g.yas pas mche ba g.yon zhags 'dzin* | OṂ *VAJRAŚṚṄKHALE (corr. : BA DZRA SHRĪ KHA LE Cod.) VAṂ | *nub sgor snang byed dmar mo ni | phyag gnyis nyi zla lcags sgrog 'dzin* | OṂ *VAJRAGHAṆṬE (corr. : BA DZRA GA ṆṬE Cod.) HOḤ | *byang sgor thal byed mdog ljang du | sang rgyas gzugs dang dril bu'o.*

tathāgattattvasaṃgraha,[350] is very much in the Kāpālika style of the pantheons of Bhairavas and Yoginīs taught in the Vidyāpīṭha.

Second, it is in the tradition of this Tantra that we see for the first time in the Mantranaya the practice of the *gaṇamaṇḍalam*, orgiastic worship in an assembly consisting of a male and a group of female adepts (*yoginīgaṇaḥ*) personifying the deities of the cult, with a jargon of special terms and gestures known as *chommāḥ* to be used in these gatherings.[351] Both these features, collective orgiastic worship of deity-personifying Yoginīs and the use of *chommāḥ*, are distinctive features of the Śākta Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha.[352]

Third, we see here for the first time the complete abandoning of the mixed prose and verse style inherited from the Mahāyānasūtras in favour of one that resembles that of the Śaiva scriptures in consisting entirely of Anuṣṭubh verse, barring the Mantras, and also the disappearance of the traditional Buddhist preamble maintained up to the time of the *Guhyasamāja*, stating the occasion and place of the revelation.[353] It is also in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya*, the supplementary continuation (*uttaratantra*) of this Tantra, that we see the first appearance in the Mantranaya of the Śaiva method of teaching Mantras in encrypted form to be decoded by the process known as *mantroddhāraḥ*; and with this development we encounter what is at present our earliest evidence of Buddhist-Śaiva intertextuality. A passage of seven verses that prescribes for this purpose the drawing of a square with forty-nine cells (*koṣṭhakāni*) and the arranging of the forty-nine letters within them corresponds very closely to one in the *Vīṇāśikha* of the *vāmasrotaḥ* division of the Vidyāpīṭha.[354]

---

[350] See *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, sections 165–176 and *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, p. 46 (Vajradhūpā, Vajrapuṣpā, Vajrālokā, and Vajragandhā).

[351] The practice and the jargon are outlined by Āryadeva in his *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (pp. 82–60: *prapañcatācaryā*) on the authority of this Tantra. The Yoginīs personified here are the twenty that form the retinue of Vajrasattva, the eight peculiar to him being Śaṃvarī, Ahosukhā, Pradīpā, Śiṣyā, Buddhabodhi, Dharmacakrā, Trailokyā, and Kāmalatā.

[352] On such worship in Śākta Śaivism see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 280–288; and *Tantrāloka* 28.6–111, 372c–385b (*yoginīmelakaḥ*, *cakrayāgaḥ*, *mūrtiyāgaḥ*), 29.66, 78–79. On *chommāḥ* in these traditions see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 333 and the sources quoted in footnotes 331–332.

[353] The Tantra begins as follows (*Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba*, f. 151r1–2: 1.1 *sems dpa' sangs rgyas kun gyi dngos | rdo rje sems dpa' bde ba'i mchog | gsang ba mchog gi dgyes pa na | thams cad bdag nyid rtag tu gzhugs* | 1.2 *'di ni rang byung bcos ldan 'das | gcig bu rab tu phye ba'i lha | sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha' 'gro sgyu ma bde ba'i mchog* (**rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ | sarvabuddhamayaḥ sattvo vajrasattvaḥ paraṃ sukham || asau svayambhūr bhagavān eka evādhidaivataḥ || sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaraḥ*). Cf. the opening verses of the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*, which are evidently based on it: *athāto rahasyaṃ vakṣye samāsān na tu vistarāt | śrīherukasaṃyogaṃ sarvakāmārthasādhakam* || 1.2 *uttarād api cottaraṃ ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram | rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ* || 1.3 *sarvaḍākinīmayaḥ sattvo vajrasattvaḥ paraṃ sukham | asau hi svayambhūr bhagavān vīro ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*; and the following citation of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, p. 82: *athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi sarvato viśvam uttamam | sarvabuddhasamāyogaṃ ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram || rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ | sarvabuddhamayaḥ śrīmān vajrasattvodayaḥ sukhaḥ*. These verses are 1–2 of the *Kalpa* 6 of the Tantra, corresponding to the Tibetan, except that that seems to have had a different version of the first line (f. 159v4–5): ***de nas gzhan yang thams cad du*** | ***rnam pa sna tshogs mchog 'byung pa'i*** | *sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha' 'gro sgyu ma'i* ***bde mchog bshad***. For the requirement of a preamble see, e.g., the Mahāyānist *Dharmasaṃgītisūtra* as quoted by Abhayākaragupta in the introduction to his *Abhayapaddhati* f. 1v: *kāladeśadeśakaparṣatsāmagrī hi deśanāyā nidānam enāṃ vinā deśanānupapatteḥ. tatra evaṃ mayeti mama dharmaḥ saṃgātavyaḥ ...ity uktaṃ bhagavatā dharmasaṃgītisūtre* 'For the preamble that establishes the authenticity of a teaching [comprises] all these factors together, namely the time, place, teacher, and congregation, because without all those it cannot be [accepted as] a teaching. To this effect the Buddha has declared in the *Dharmasaṃgītisūtra* ...: 'My teachings must be recited with [the opening phrase] "Thus I [...]"'; and the unnamed *Sūtra* quoted by Tathāgatarakṣita on *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 1.1: *mayi parinirvṛte bhikṣava evaṃ mayetyādikayā mama dharmaḥ saṃgātavyaḥ* 'O monks, after I have been completely extinguished [by death] you should recite my teachings with the words "Thus I ...".

The intensification of the Śākta Śaiva character of the Mantranaya evident in this text is accompanied by the implication that this Buddhism is one that has conquered that tradition, transforming it, as it were, from within into a vehicle for Buddhist salvation. For while wrathful Heruka appears with Kāpālika iconography and a retinue of Yoginīs he wears, as we have seen, the freshly flayed skin of Bhairava over his shoulders; and the Tantra relates that its deity in its commitment to purify all beings has violently overpowered Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and Kāmadeva, and taken their consorts by force for his own enjoyment.[355] This rhetoric of appropriation is reflected in the Mantras of Heruka's Vajraḍākinīs. Pramohā, who, as we have seen, has the boar face of Viṣṇu's Ādivarāha incarnation, is invoked as Vajranārāyaṇī, Caurī as Vajracaṇḍeśvarī, and Ghasmarī as Vajramāheśvarī.[356] Furthermore, Heruka's first appearance in the Mantranaya is in the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, where his name appears in a Mantra for the drawing of all the [Śaiva] Mother-goddesses into Buddhism, and it is that, with the insertion of a single seed syllable, that is adopted as the Mantra of Heruka in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*.[357] The very title of the work alludes to this assimilation, since it is evidently calqued on those of two Vidyāpīṭha scriptures, the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga* and the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*.[358]

---

[354] This has been demonstrated in TOMABECHI 2007. The Śaiva passage is *Vīṇāśikha* 52–58. That in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* is DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 194v6–195r5.

[355] *Śaṃvaratantra* (= *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*) quoted in *Jñānasiddhi* 18.10–18 (pp. 153–154): *sarvaśuddhyadhimokṣeṇa prasahya balavān adhaḥ | parākramakramaṇāt tu sarvalokān pramardayet || anyaṃ tu duṣṭaraudrograṃ sattvadhātum anekadhā || pāpaiś corair avaskandhaiḥ sarvam eva viśodhayet | cchalena māyayā caiva prasahya balavān adhaḥ || pañcāyudhanibandhaiś ca sarvalokān jayet tadā | vijitya sakalāṃ siddhiṃ jagat sthāvarajaṅgamam || vicitravinayopāyaiḥ svaparān anupālayet | kāminīnāṃ bhavet kāmo raudrāṇāṃ raudram uttamam || saumyānāṃ paramaṃ saumyaṃ haṭhānāṃ haṭhavikramaḥ | parameśaṃ samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ ||* ***umādevīṃ*** *samākṛṣya copabhogair bhunakty asau |* ***nārāyaṇaṃ*** *samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ ||* ***rūpiṇīṃ*** *tu samākṛṣya upabhogair bhunakty asau |* ***prajāpatiṃ*** *samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ |* ***praśāntadevīm*** *āsādya upabhogair bhunakty asau ||* ***kāmadevaṃ*** *samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ |* ***ratiprītidhṛtyaiśvaryaṃ*** *samākramya bhunakty asau*. This corresponds to

The Yoginītantras and the Full Appropriation of Vidyāpīṭha Śaivism

With the Yoginītantras proper we reach the final stage of this process of absorption. The principal among the numerous Tantras of this class are the

---

Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba, ff. 158v7–159r5, except that there Parameśa's (Śiva's) consort is Bhīmādevī (f. 159r2: *lha mo bhi mo*) and Nārāyaṇa's (Viṣṇu's) is Rukmiṇi (f. 159r3: *ru gmi ni*).

[356] *Vajrajvālodayā*, f. 176v: HUṂ VAJRANĀRĀYAṆI JHIR *iti* (em. : *jhirati* Cod.) *pramohāṃ*); *ibid.*: HUṂ VAJRACAṆḌEŚVARI KHAṬVĀṄGI MAHĀVAJRI KAPĀLAMĀLĀMUKUṬE RULU RULU HUṂ *iti caurīm*. Ghasmarī is invoked as Vajramāheśvarī in the Mantras of the retinue of Heruka given in the *Saṃpuṭodbhava* : OṂ VAJRAMĀHEŚVARI HAṂ HAṂ HAṂ HAṂ HAḤ RULU RULU RULU BHYO HŪṂ PHAṬ BHAKṢAYA SARVADUṢṬĀN NIRMATHA HṚDAYAṂ HŪṂ PHAṬ SVĀHĀ | *ghasmaryāḥ* (f. 81r4–5). There are other examples of the assimilative transformation of non-Buddhist deities in the Mantranaya, marked, as here, by the prefixing of Vajra- to their names. For example, the deities Vajranārāyaṇa, [Vajra]caṇḍīśvara, and Vajrapadmodbhava, that is to say, Vajrayānist transformations of Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Brahmā, together with their consorts Vajraśrī, Vajragaurī, and Vajratārā, join Ākāśagarbha and Khavajriṇī to form the retinue of Vajrasattva in the central section of the abridged Maṇḍala (*bsdus pa'i dkyil 'khor*) of the Yogatantra *Paramādya*, a text with which the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* is closely related (TOMABECHI 2007, p. 904; TANAKA 1996, pp. 271–272). That disposition of deities is taught (see TANAKA 1996, pp. 96–103) in the *mChog dang po'i sngags kyi rtog pa'i dum bu* (**Śrīparamādyamantrakalpakhaṇḍa*) (Tōh. 488) according to Ānandagarbha's *mChog dang po'i rgya cher bshad pa* (**Paramādyaṭīkā*) (Tōh. 2512).

[357] *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 794: OṂ HERUKAVAJRASAMAYA SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAÑJAKA HUṂ PHAṬ *sarvamātṝṇām iti*; *Vajrajvālodayā*: OṂ HERUKAVAJRASAMAYA H<R>ĪḤ SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAÑJAKA HUṂ PHAṬ *iti svamantreṇa śrīherukaṃ niveśayet*.

[358] On these two scriptures see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 234–236 and footnotes 21–22. The expression *sarvavīrasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*, without the substitution of *-buddha-* for *-vīra-*, is seen in the Yoginītantras of Cakrasaṃvara. It appears in, e.g., *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*, f. 8r3 (8.1) and f. 24v4 (31.13ef): *tataḥ sarvavīrasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*; and *Saṃvarodaya* 3.6cd: *sarvavīrasamāyogaḍākinījālasatsukham*. In the last *satsukham* is a tacit semantic analysis of *śaṃvaraḥ*.

Laghuśaṃvara also called *Cakrasaṃvara* and *Herukābhidhāna*, the *Hevajra*, the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Vajrāmṛta*, the *Buddhakapāla*, the *Mahāmāyā*, the *Rigyārali*, the *Vajrārali*, the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa*, and the *Kālacakra*. Two of these texts, the *Laghuśaṃvara* of the Heruka called Śaṃvara (bDe mchog) or Cakrasaṃvara ('Khor lo sdom pa) and the *Hevajra* of the Heruka Hevajra held centre-stage, a position they later shared with the *Kālacakra* when that text was propagated towards the end of the tenth century, during the reign of Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027).[359] Their importance is reflected in the shere quantity of commentaries and other texts devoted to the cult of their deities. The Tenjur contains translations of eleven commentaries on the *Hevajra* and of eleven on the *Laghuśaṃvara*, and of about two hundred other explanatory texts related to each. Moreover, they both have a number of satellite Tantras, the *Hevajra* five and the *Laghuśaṃvara* over fifty.[360] The principal among these, those that received commentaries, are for the *Hevajra* the *Ḍākinīvajrapañjara* and the *Mahāmudrātilaka*, and for the *Laghuśaṃvara* the *Herukābhyudaya*, the *Vajraḍāka*, the *Abhidhānottara*, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, the *Saṃvarodaya*, and the *Ḍākārṇava*. Another major Yoginītantra, the *Saṃpuṭodbhava*, on which we have an important commentary, the *Āmnāyamañjarī*, by Abhayākaragupta (1064–1125),[361] pertains to both cycles.[362]

---

[359] On the date of the *Kālacakra* see here p. 96. On the establishing of this tradition and how it positioned itself in relation to earlier Tantric Buddhism see SFERRA 2005.

[360] This large total includes thirty-four texts (Tōh. 383–416), forming a supplementary collection, as it were, of related *opera minora*, totalling less than 150 pages. Though included in the Kanjur they were classified by Bu ston (1290–1364) as supplementary Tantras whose authenticity, that is to say, Indian origin, was the subject of debate (*rgyud yang dag yin min rtsod pa can*). The great majority are claimed in their colophons to be translations prepared in the early eleventh century by 'Brog mi in collaboration with the Indian Gayadhara. On the lay Tantric Gayadhara, who is mentioned in no Indian source known to me but is the subject of many partly conflicting accounts in Tibet, where he was venerated as the Indian source of the Lam 'bras tradition and for having collaborated with several Tibetan translators, see STEARNS 2001, pp. 47–55. It is, however, certain that not all these *opera minora* are of suspect authenticity. For my pupil Péter-Dániel Szántó has recently identified the original Sanskrit of one, the *Anāvilatantra*, among the contents of a palm-leaf codex preserved in the Tokyo University Library (verbal communication).

[361] These dates rest on Tibetan tradition and are consistent with the regnal years of Rāmapāla that Abhayākaragupta has reported as the dates of composition at the end of some of his works; see here p. 126.

[362] Thus, though counted as an explanatory Tantra of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, it is grouped with the *Hevajra* and *Ḍākinīvajrapañjara* as one of the three Tantras of Hevajra (*kye rdo rje rgyud gsum*) in the Sa skya tradition of Tibet, and classified because of its mixed character as the *Hevajra*'s shared explanatory Tantra (*thun mong bshad rgyud*); see STEARNS 2001, pp. 173–174, n. 28. It also extends into the territories of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, the *Vajrabhairava*, and, as we

CHRONOLOGY AND PROVENANCE. All of these Tantras were translated into Tibetan, and all but the latest among them, the *Ḍākārṇava* and the *Saṃvarodya*, were translated in the first half of the eleventh century, during the opening phase of the later diffusion (*phyi dar*) of Indian Buddhism to Tibet, as were commentaries on the majority of those named here, most written during the course of the tenth and early eleventh centuries.

The oldest is probably the commentary of Jayabhadra on the *Laghuśaṃvara*. In chapter 38 of his *Rgya gar chos 'byung* Tāranātha includes five of our commentators on the *Laghuśaṃvara*, Jayabhadra, Bhavabhadra/Bhavabhaṭṭa, Bhavyakīrti, Durjayacandra, and Tathāgatarakṣita, among ten persons whom he holds to have occupied the office of chief Vajrācārya at Vikramaśīla in rapid unbroken succession, and claims that Jayabhadra was the first of the ten (Jayabhadra, Śrīdhara, Bhavabhadra (/Bhavabhaṭṭa), Bhavyakīrti, Līlāvajra, Durjayacandra, Kṛṣṇasamayavajra, Tathāgatarakṣita, Bodhibhadra, and Kamalarakṣita). Moreover, comparison of the commentaries, the Tibetan translation, and the only manuscript of the *Laghuśaṃvara* accessible to me at present reveals two versions of the text. Tāranātha's claim that Jayabhadra preceded all the other commentators in his list gains support from the fact that Jayabhadra knew what is evidently the earlier of these two versions. It extends only to 50.19, ending with a passage on fire-sacrifices that may be performed if one wishes to subject another to one's will (*vaśyahomaḥ*). In the second, attested by all the other commentators except Bhavyakīrti,[363] by the Tibetan translation, and by the manuscript, the fiftieth chapter has eight verses after the last of the shorter text (50.20–27), followed by a fifty-first chapter of twenty-two verses. It is clear that the longer text is the later. For the alternative, that the shorter text arose after the longer by excision of the final thirty verses, is inconceivable, since these have the effect of greatly increasing the plausibility of the whole as a Buddhist work and were no doubt added because it was felt, quite rightly, that 1.1 to 50.19 were inadequate in this regard. The only element of Mahāyāna Buddhist doctrine contained in the text up to 50.19 comprises a section of four verses (10.1–4) stating that success in the pursuit of Siddhis depends on the Sādhaka's identifying with the three Buddha bodies (Dharmakāya, Saṃbhogakāya, and Nirmāṇakāya), all other Buddhist elements being little more than a handful of occurrences of the terms Buddha, Tathāgata, and Bodhisattva, and the names of Vajrayānist deities.

Now Tāranātha claims that his ten successive Tantric Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla held their positions after the time of Buddhajñānapāda and Dīpaṅkarabhadra, whom he places in the reign of Dharmapāla (c. 775–812); and he reports that each did so for twelve years, implying thereby a form of limited tenure. Thereafter, he says, came the six "Door-keepers". Among them was Ratnākaraśānti, who taught the Tibetan translator 'Brog mi Śākya ye shes (993–1077?)[364] and the Indian Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna[365] (982–1054), and was a slightly older contemporary of Jñānaśrīmitra, who was active c. 980–1030. From this it would be a simple matter to determine the approximate date of Jayabhadra, the first of the ten, by counting the years from either end, were it not that Tāranātha makes the collective tenure of the ten Ācāryas 120 years, whereas the interval between Dīpaṅkarabhadra and Ratnākaraśānti is almost two centuries. We might be inclined to count back from Ratnākaraśānti rather than forward from Dīpaṅkarabhadra, thinking that a historian's information is likely to be more reliable the closer he approaches his own time. In that case, if we trust Tāranātha and set the end of the tenure of Kamalarakṣita in 1000, as the immediate predecessor of the Door-keepers, we will conclude that Jayabhadra's tenure ran from 880–892.

---

have seen, the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*.

[363] In Bhavyakīrti's *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* the text of the *Laghuśaṃvara* ends exactly where it does in Jayabhadra's. It is therefore likely to belong like Jayabhadra's to the earliest phase of the exegesis of this Tantra. Jayabhadra's appears to be the older of the two. In 41.8 Bhavyakīrti attests with the later witnesses the interpolation (see here p.199) **oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramalayādiṣu* (*bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 239r2: *au ḍya na | dzā la ndha ra dang pu li ra ma la ya sogs*), since he comments here (f. 36v6): *o ḍyā na du ni 'od ldan ma'o | dzā la ndha rar ni gtum mig ma'o | pu llī ra ma la ya la sogs*, whereas Jayabhadra says that Pullīramalaya has not been mentioned but must nonetheless be understood to be intended (p. 137: *pullīramalayo na nirdiṣṭaḥ sarvapīṭhānāṃ pradhānatvād upadeśād vāvaseyaḥ*). It seems probable, then, that Bhavyakīrti follows the reading of a subsequent redaction in which this 'omission' had been rectified.

At the beginning of the translation the name of Bhavyakīrti's commentary is said to be *Śūramanojñā* in Sanskrit and *dpa' bo'i yid du 'ong* in Tibetan, i.e. 'pleasing to heroes'. But the Sanskrit titles given in the Tenjur are so often inaccurate that we can conclude that they do not reach us from the Sanskrit works themselves but are reconstructions from the Tibetan added by the compilers of the Tenjur. The Sanskrit rendered by *dPa' bo'i yid du 'ong* can now only be guessed, but its first element was surely *Vīra-* rather than *Śūra-*. The *Mahāvyutpatti*, composed to guide Tibetan translators and no doubt the dictionary used by the compilers of the Tenjur, gives *dpa' bo* to render both *vīra-* and *śūra-*, both meaning 'hero'; but though the two words are synonymous in ordinary usage, in the tradition of the Yoginītantras it is the former alone that is used in the special sense evidently intended here, that is, as a technical term for the Tantric practitioner. As for the second element, the same dictionary gives *manojña-* for *yid du 'ong*. But the result is unattractive by the standards of Sanskrit authors, who generally sought, like authors everywhere, to give their works titles that appealed to the ear. *Vīramanoramā* is synonymous and meets this requirement.

[364] *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 84.

[365] *Blue Annals*, p. 380.

However, this chronology can be reconciled with other reports only at a great stretch, at least for the later teachers in Tāranātha's succession. Thus Dmar ston, pupil of Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182–1251) tells us[366] that Durjayacandra, who by this calculation would have held office from 940 to 952, was the teacher of Prajñendraruci, also called Vīravajra, and that the latter taught 'Brog mi Śākya ye shes. Now 'Brog mi is said to have let Tibet for Nepal and India when Rin chen bzang po was nearly fifty years old,[367] that is to say around 1007 if Rin chen bzang po was born in 958, as his biography claims and Gzhon nu dpal accepts,[368] and then, after spending one year in Nepal with Śāntibhadra[369] and eight at Vikramaśīla with Ratnākaraśānti,[370] to have studied with Prajñendraruci for three or four,[371] that is to say, therefore, c. 1016–1020. If we accept that Durjayacandra is unlikely to have held such a senior post as that of the head Vajrācārya of Vikramaśīla in his youth and assume for the sake of argument that he was fifty-five when he began his tenure, then if that tenure began in 940, he would have to have been continuing to teach long after his retirement at sixty-seven in 952, and Prajñendraruci, if we take 945 as the latest plausible year of his birth, would have been about seventy when he accepted 'Brog mi as his pupil.

This scenario is not impossible; but neither is it comfortable. Nor is it helped by the fact that Prajñendraruci is reported to have collaborated with 'Brog mi on translations of texts pertaining to Hevajra and his consort Nairātmyā. This evidence is given in the colophons at the end of these translations[372] and should be considered more reliable than that of hagiographical biographies.

Even more difficult to reconcile is the report in the *Chos 'byung* of Pad ma dkar po (1527–1592) that Durjayacandra taught the Mantranaya at Vikramaśīla to the translator Rin chen bzang po.[373] For Rin chen bzang po is said to have left for India in 975, at the age of seventeen, and to have gone to Vikramaśīla only after a period of some seven years of education in Kashmir, therefore around 982. At that time Durjayacandra would have been nearly a hundred if we hold to the assumption that he began his tenure in 940 when he was fifty-five years of age.[374] It is probable, then, that while we are indeed closer to the truth if

---

[366] *Zhib mo rdo rje*, pp. 86–88.
[367] *Blue Annals*, p. 205, ll. 26–31.
[368] *Blue Annals*, p. 68, ll. 3–6.
[369] *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 84, ll. 6–10; *Blue Annals*, p. 205, ll. 32–35.
[370] *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 86, l. 10; *Blue Annals*, p. 206, ll. 18–19.
[371] *Blue Annals*, p. 206, ll. 32–33 (three years); *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 88, ll. 7–8 (four years).
[372] Tōh. 1185, 1236, 1251, 1310.
[373] TUCCI 1988, p. 35.
[374] TUCCI 1988, pp. 3–4.

we calculate back from the Door-keepers than forward from Buddhajñāna and Dīpaṅkarabhadra, Tāranātha has placed the later teachers from Durjayacandra onwards too early.

This suspicion gains further support from what we know of the life of Tathāgatarakṣita. If Tāranātha's report were accurate, provided that we calculate backwards from the six Door-keepers, then he would have held office at Vikramaśīla c. 964–976. But we learn from the colophon of the Tibetan translation of his commentary on the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* that he translated the work himself with the help of the Tibetan Ba ri Lo tsā ba Rin chen grags. This places his activity well into the second half of the eleventh century. For Ba ri Rin chen grags is said by Gzhon nu dpal to have been born in 1040.[375]

If Durjayacandra, as now seems probable, was active towards the end of the tenth century, and if Tāranātha is correct that there were no intervals between the tenures of his predecessors Jayabhadra, Śrīdhara, Bhavabhadra, Bhavyakīrti, and Līlāvajra, then we shall not be far from the truth if we assign them all these commentators on the *Laghuśaṃvara* to the tenth century.

Beyond the *terminus* provided by this tentative dating of the earliest commentators we have no clear knowledge of the date of these Tantras. It has been claimed by DAVIDSON that the *Laghuśaṃvara* was already in existence in the eighth century since Vilāsavajra cites it several times in his commentary on the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*;[376] and this view has recently been repeated by GRAY.[377] The latter recognized that most of the former's claimed citations are actually not of the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra* but of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, which Vilāsavajra cites as the *Śaṃvaratantra*, using the common abbreviation of this unwieldy title. But he argues that the date is established nonetheless by two places in the same commentary in which Vilāsavajra cites a *Cakrasaṃvaratantra* or *Cakraśaṃvaratantra*. This GRAY takes to be the *Laghuśaṃvara* under its commonly used *alias*. Both citations occur in a section of the commentary in which, explaining epithets found in the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*, Vilāsavajra follows each with *iti* and the name of a Tantra in the locative, indicating that the epithet is also found in that source. The first citation, GRAY claims, is of *Laghuśaṃvara* 2.16c (f. 2v6: *hasticarmāvaruddhaṃ ca* 'and [his back] covered with the hide of an elephant'), and the second of 48.12a (f. 35r6: *kaṅkāla mahākaṅkāla*). In fact the first passage does not cite *Laghuśaṃvara* 2.16c, the text quoted being *gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk* 'wearing as his upper garment the moist hide of an elephant', to which *Laghuśaṃvara* 2.16c corresponds only in sense and then not exactly.[378] As for the second citation,[379] the word *kaṅkālaḥ* does appear in the *Laghuśaṃvara*, as the name of one of the twenty-four Vīra consorts of the twenty-four Ḍākinīs,[380] but as a single word its presence is not enough to establish the identity of Vilāsavajra's *Cakrasaṃvara* with the *Laghuśaṃvara*. On the other hand, the fact that the first epithet attributed to the *Cakrasaṃvara* does not occur in the *Laghuśaṃvara* is not sufficient to prove the opposing thesis, that Vilāsavajra was referring to another work. For it is conceivable that he was citing the text not for the exact wording of *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 69d (*gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk*) but only for an expression close to it in meaning. But if this is true it establishes, of course, only that Vilāsavajra may have been referring to *Laghuśaṃvara* 2.16c, not that he was. To continue to hold to the position that Vilāsavajra must have been referring to our *Laghuśaṃvara* in spite of these considerations, one has to put one's trust in the fact that the *Laghuśaṃvara* is also known as the *Cakrasaṃvara* and the fact that no other work of this name is cited (unless it be here). One must also remain free of the suspicion that there might have been another, earlier work with this title among the numerous Tantras known in the eighth century that have failed to survive either in Sanskrit or in Tibetan translation.[381] One must also overlook the evidence of the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself. For that refers to a *Cakrasaṃvara* in a list of its own predecessors.[382] I conclude, therefore, that there is no more than

---

[375] *Blue Annals*, p. 211.
[376] DAVIDSON 1981, pp. 7–8.
[377] GRAY 2007, pp. 12–14.

---

[378] Vilāsavajra, *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* A f. 57r1–2, on *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 69d (*gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk*): *gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛg iti śrīcakrasaṃvare | gajasya carma gajacarma paṭaś cāsāv ārdraś ca | gajacarmaiva paṭārdraḥ gajacarmapaṭārdraḥ | taṃ dhārayatīti gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk*. This error has been pointed out by SZÁNTÓ (2008b, p. 217).

[379] Vilāsavajra, *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* A f. 55v6, on *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 67cd (*daṃṣṭrākarālaḥ kaṅkālo halāhalaḥ śatānanaḥ*): *kaṅkāla iti śrīcakrasaṃvare.*

[380] *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 35r4–7 (48.9c–12): *vajrasattva vairocana padmanarteśvaras tathā | śrīvajraherukaś caiva ākāśagarbha hayagrīvam eva ca* || 10 *ratnavajra mahābala virūpākṣa bhairavas tathā | vajrabhadra subhadraś caiva <va>jrahūṃkāram eva ca* || 11 *mahāvīra vajrajaṭilaṃ tu aṅkurika vajradehaka | vajraprabha amitābhaḥ surāvairiṇo vikaṭadaṃṣṭriṇam eva ca* || 12 *kaṅkāla mahākaṅkāla khaṇḍakāpālinādi tu caturviṃśativīrāṇāṃ sarvaṃ vyāptam akhilaṃ jagat.*

[381] Such works cited in Vilāsavajra's commentary are the *Krodhendutilaka* (A f. 57r5), the *Guhyakośa* (A f. 57v1), the *Vajraghanoccaya* (B f. 39r6), the *Ṣaṭprajñānayaśaṃvara* (B f. 40v3), the *Sarvatantrasamuccaya* (A f. 57r4), and the *Vajrakirīṭi* (A f. 56v6). Similarly, in the *Tattvasiddhi* of Śāntarakṣita we find the *Sarvadevasamāgama*, the *Laukikalokottaravajra*, and the *Vimuktisamudghāṭana*, and in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* of Āryadeva the *Vajramukhīmahāyoga* and the *Vinayāmoghasiddhi*.

[382] *Laghuśaṃvara* 27.23–24a as transmitted in *Abhidhānottara*, Paṭala 43, A f. 140r1–2f, B f. 180v3–4: *tattvasaṃgrahe yad uktaṃ ca tathoktaṃ cakraśaṃvare*

a possibility that Vilāsavajra knew the *Laghuśaṃvara* and, therefore, that the existence of this Tantra in the eighth century remains unproved.

What we can say with confidence is that the *Laghuśaṃvara* came after the *Paramādya*, the *Vajrabhairava*, the *Sarvatathāgatasaṃgraha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, since it names these,[383] and tacitly incorporates verses from the last three in its earliest accessible redaction.[384] These borrowings do not rule out the possibility that the

---

| guhyatantre samākhyātaṃ haritantre tathaiva ca || mahābhairavatantre ca japavratādisiddhidam | tad idaṃ dhyānamātreṇa mantrī sādhayate kṣaṇāt. The reading *cakraśaṃvare* (*cakrasamvare* Cod.) is confirmed by Bhavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on this verse (*Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 495).

[383] *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 4v2–3 (3.22): *abhiṣikto bhavet tatra sarvvatantraikam uttaram | tattvasaṃgrahe śaṃvare vāpi guhye vā vajrabhairave*; and f. 23v7 (30.24): *vidyārājacakravarti ayam mantro na bhūyo na bhaviṣyati | tattvasaṃgrahe paramādye śaṃvare guhye vā vajrabhairave*. The *Śaṃvara* here is the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*. The title is commonly so abbreviated; see also Indrabhūti's comment on the first passage (*'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad*, f. 38r7): *bde mchog ni sgyu ma bde mchog go* 'The *Śaṃvara* is the *Jālaśaṃvara*'. In his *Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti* Indrabhūti takes the *Guhya* here to be the *Guhyasamāja* or the *Guhyendumaṇitilaka/Guhyendutilaka* (Tōh. 477) (f. 38r7): *gsang ba ni 'dus pa 'am zla gsang thig le'i nor bu'i rgyal po'o*. In his *Cakrasaṃvaraṭīkā* Devagupta takes it to be "the *Guhyasamāja* etc." (f. 80r5): *bsdus pa la sogs par*. But in his *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses *guhyatantre* in 27.23 as *guhyakośādau* 'in the *Guhyakośa* etc.'.

[384] (1) *Laghuśaṃvara* (LŚ) f. 1v5 (1.7c–8b): *antargatena manasā kāmasiddhiṃ tu bhāvayet | svaretobindubhir buddhān bodhisattvāṃś ca pūjayet* < *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 2651: *antargatena manasā kāmaśuddhiṃ tu bhāvayan | svaretobindubhir buddhān pūjayan siddhim āpnuyāt*, but influenced in the second line by *Guhyasamāja* 7.26: *svavajraṃ padmasaṃyuktaṃ dvayendriyaprayogataḥ | svaretobindubhir buddhān vajrasattvāṃś ca pūjayet*; (2) *bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 234r5-6 (LŚ 31.1): *de nas sha chen thams cad kyi | 'jigs byed rdo rje skyes yin bshad 'di ni gdug pa thams cad kyi | 'jigs byed mi bzad par bshad do* < *Guhyasamāja* 5.78: *mahāmāṃsena sarveṣāṃ nāśanaṃ vajrajaṃ smṛtam | eṣo hi sarvakrūrāṇāṃ nāśako dāruṇaiḥ smṛtaḥ*; (3) *bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 234v4 (LŚ 31.12): *sa ni spyan zhes bya bar bshad | chu khams mā ma kī ru brjod | me ni gos dkar mor bshad de | rlung ni sgrol mar rab tu brjod* < *Guhyasamāja* 17.51: *pṛthivī locanā khyātā abdhātur māmakī smṛtā | pāṇḍarākhyā bhavet tejo vāyus tārā prakīrtitā*; (4) LŚ f. 1v (1.1–3) < *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* (SBSḌJŚ) 1.1–2 etc. (see here p. 154); (5) LŚ f. 1v5–6 (1.8c–9b): *darśanasparśanābhyāṃ ca śravaṇe smaraṇena ca || mucyate sarvapāpais tu evam eva na saṃśayaḥ* < SBSḌJŚ as quoted in *Jñānasiddhi* 15.50: *darśanasparśanābhyāṃ ca śravaṇasmaraṇena ca | sarvapāpair vimucyante *yujyante* (em. : *pūjyante* Ed.) *sarvasiddhibhiḥ* (= *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba* f. 152v3 [2.16]); (6) LŚ ff. 1v7–2r1 (1.11c–13b): *madhu raktaṃ sakarpūraṃ raktacandanayojitam | gaṇamadhye pratiṣṭhan tu* [+ *sarvocchiṣṭarasāyanam* in the earlier redaction incorporated in the *Abhidhānottara* A f. 146r1–3 (46.3–5b)] *sarvavajrāṅkacihnadhṛk | anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ lehayed yogavit sadā || somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnoti śāśvatīm* < *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba* f. 158v4–5 (SBSḌJŚ 6.15–17): *dmar*

Laghuśaṃvara was composed in that century, since none of the works is later than that time. But three considerations suggest a later date. (1) No text of the Cakrasaṃvara corpus, or any other Yoginītantra, was translated into Tibetan during the earlier diffusion of Buddhism (*snga dar*) that occurred from the eighth century to the middle of the ninth, during Tibet's imperial period: this new literature reached the Tibetans only during the later transmission (*phyi dar*), that began c. 1000. (2) Among the many surviving stone, metalwork, and painted Indian images of Śaṃvara none is demonstrably earlier than the tenth century.[385] Finally (3), there is, as we have seen, no evidence of commentatorial work on the *Laghuśaṃvara* before c. 900. Of course, none of these facts proves conclusively that the *Laghuśaṃvara* was not in existence at an earlier date. But they do incline one to consider a later date more probable. This is particularly so in the case of the absence of commentaries. The *Laghuśaṃvara* is so problematic text from the Buddhist point of view that it is hard to imagine that it could have survived for long without the support of learned exegesis.

Whatever its date, the *Laghuśaṃvara* is likely to be a product of the first phase of the development of the Yoginītantras, if not the earliest of them all. This surmise rests on the assumption that Yoginītantras that are less sophisticated in the sense that they show a less developed Mahāyāna Buddhist theo-

---

chen dang ni ga bur bcas | tsa ndan dmar por sbyar ba dag | tshogs kyi dbus su bzhag pa ni | ra sa ya na kun slong ba | rang gi lha yo sbyor ldan pas | srin lag dang ni mthe bo'i rtses | zhi ba'i btung pa bzhin myangs na | rtag pa yi ni dngos grub thob (**mahāraktaṃ sakarpūraṃ raktacandanayojitam | svādhidaivatayogena sarvocchiṣṭarasāyanam | anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ* <+++++++++> | *somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnoti śāśvatīm*); and (7) LŚ f. 12r6–7 (13.2): *yad yad indriyamārgatvaṃ yāyāt tat tat svabhāvataḥ | paramāhitayogena sarvaṃ buddhamayaṃ vahet* <SBSḌJŚ as quoted in *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, p. 90: *yad yad indriyamārgatvam yāyāt tat tat svabhāvataḥ | asamāhitayogena sarvabuddhamayam vahet.*

[385] A Kashmirian Śaṃvara of leaded brass inlaid with copper and silver in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art from the Nasli and Alice Heeramaneck Collection appears to have been assigned by PAL to c. 725 in his catalogue of the exhibition 'The Arts of Kashmir' (2007, p. 91, fig. 92). However, he has kindly informed me (personal communication, 1 March, 2008) that this surprisingly early date is not his own but that of the museum (for which see http://collectionsonline.lacma.org) recorded on the loan agreement form. The lending museum insisted on this date and it was substituted for his own without consulting him. He had assigned it to "*ca.* 9th century". In an earlier publication (1975, p. 173, pls. 64a,b) he had proposed the tenth. REEDY (1997, p. 162, fig. K62) gives '9th–10th century'. LINROTHE (1999, p. 289, fig. 211) has found these dates too early and suggests the late tenth or early eleventh century. In the absence of a detailed art-historical demonstration of the date, which I suspect could in any case be no more than tentative given the small population of comparable pieces, I am inclined in the light of the other historical evidence to agree with LINROTHE.

retical framework are likely to be earlier than those in which the level of theoretical assimilation is more advanced. By this criterion the *Hevajra* must be placed after the *Laghuśaṃvara*. This also assumes that the development of the Mantranaya was not unilinear throughout, since if it were we would have to place the *Laghuśaṃvara* before the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, *Guhyasamāja*, and *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*. It assumes, then, that the Yoginītantras represent a new phase with its own humble beginning, and that it was only later in this phase that the tradition got up to speed, as it were, by fully integrating the new world of practice whose entry marks its commencement by providing it with a thoroughly Buddhist encoding. While it is possible that this assimilation of the text began long after its first redaction it seems more probable in the absence of firm evidence to the contrary that if so problematic a creation were to have remained for long without the benefit of learned exegesis it would be likely to have disappeared without trace.

As for the provenance of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, it was certainly eastern India, the region in which most of the Indian learned exegesis of this Tantric corpus was produced. The Tantra does not state this explicitly. Claiming the status of revelation it would have been averse to doing so. Nonetheless, it reveals its provenance in spite of itself by giving BA in its encoding of some of the syllables of Mantras where correct Sanskrit requires VA. This is evidently an effect of the fact that *va* is pronounced *ba* in the Indo-Aryan vernaculars of this region.[386] Thus 5.4 yields BHAGABATE rather than BHAGAVATE: *pañcamasya yac caturthaṃ prathamasya tṛtīyam | trayoviṃśas tathaiva ca caturthasya yaṇ prathamam* (f. 5r3–4) 'the fourth of the fifth [class of consonants] (BHA), the third of the first (GA), the twenty-third (BA), and the first of the fourth (T-)' ; and 30.20–21 yields BHAGABĀṂ rather than BHAGAVĀṂ (for BHAGAVĀN): *koṣṭhakād daśamaṃ caiva vilomena tu sādhakaḥ | koṣṭhakā ekonaviṃśatimaṃ tathā trayoviṃśatikoṣṭhakād | dvitīyakoṣṭhasaṃyuktaṃ bindunā ūrdhvabhūṣitaṃ* (f. 23v4–5) 'The Sādhaka should select the tenth counting backwards from the compartment [of HA] (BHA), the nineteenth from that [of A] (GA), and the [letter] from the twenty-third box (B-) together with [the letter in] the second box adorned above with a dot (ĀṂ)'.

Variant readings giving the correct spellings in these cases are found. In 5.4 Jayabhadra and Bhavabhaṭṭa read *ekonnatriṃśa-* (*sic*) and *ekonatriṃśati* 'the twenty-ninth' (VA) rather than the *trayoviṃśa-* 'the twenty-third' (BA) seen in the Baroda manuscript; and this reading is also found in the Tibetan translation (*de bzhin nyi shu tsa dgu la* [= *ekonatriṃśaṃ tathaiva ca*]) and the redaction of this passage in Paṭala 54 of the *Abhidhānottara* (A f. 166r3: *ekonnatrinśaṃ tathaiva ca*). Likewise in 30.21 we find Jayabhadra giving *ekonatriṃśati-* (VA) in place of the reading *trayoviṃśati* (BA) attested by the manuscript, but here the 'incorrect' reading is also supported by the Tibetan translation and the commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa. There can be little doubt that the non-standard readings giving BA rather than VA are original. For it is not surprising there should have been attempts to correct an original BA to VA, whereas it would be most unlikely that any redactor would have made the effort to rewrite a reading that gave VA in order to yield BA.[387]

---

[386] This is so in Bihārī, Maithilī, Bengali, Kumāunī, Nepālī, Assamese, and Oṛiyā.

Also indicative of the east-Indian provenance and development of this corpus are the form *chaṃdoha-* in place of *saṃdoha-*,[388] and the pervasive promiscuity of the forms -śaṃvara- and -saṃvara- in the names of its deity, in the title of the primary Tantra, and in the compound in which this form is preceded by *ḍākinījāla-* or *yoginījāla-*. I use the forms Śaṃvara and Cakrasaṃvara. *Laghuśaṃvara* and *Cakrasaṃvara* here in keeping with the usual Tibetan translations, namely bDe mchog and 'Khor lo sdom pa; and this accords with semantic analyses of these names and titles in the Sanskrit commentators. Thus Bhavabhaṭṭa explains the second element of the second in the sense 'he who restrains' from the the verb *saṃvṛ-*, and construes the whole to mean 'he who by means of the wheel (*cakra-*) [of the Dharma] restrains [the minds of living beings from the wrong path] (*-saṃvaraḥ*)' (**cakreṇa saṃvṛṇotīti cakrasaṃvaraḥ*), telling us further that the name is extended to the Tantra because this deity is its subject.[389] As for the form Śaṃvara, that too is widely supported. Ratnākaraśānti explains it as meaning 'the Highest (*varam*) Bliss' (*śam*) when analysing its occurrence in the neuter in the compound *ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*;[390] and Bhavabhaṭṭa when analysing its occurrence in the masculine gender at the end of the same (*ḍākinījālaśaṃvaraḥ*) takes it to mean '[Heruka,] who protects Bliss (*śaṃ vṛṇotīti śaṃvaraḥ*) [by keeping it free of all defects]'.[391] This line of analysis, which applies a meaning of *śam* that is well-attested in non-sectarian lexicography,[392] is not the invention of these commentators. They draw on the authority of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*, which refers to its deity Vajrasattva as Śaṃvara and explains that name as meaning '[he who has/is the] Highest Bliss'.[393] That the -śaṃvara form is not only old but also original is established by evidence outside the Buddhist corpus. For Yoginījālaśaṃvara is found as the name of a Bhairava in one of the secondary Kalpas taught in the Śākta Śaiva *Picumata*,[394] which, as we shall see, was a major unacknowledged source for the redactor of the *Laghuśaṃvara*. That the form intended there is -śaṃvara- rather than -saṃvara- is certain, because the text provides a semantic analysis that takes the first syllable to mean bliss (*sukham*).[395]

---

[387] It is not probable that the *Laghuśaṃvara* was alone among the Yoginītantras in being of east-Indian origin. We see the same tell-tale B- for V- in 1.4.27–28 of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the Mantra syllables VAḌAVE being encoded there as BAḌABE. Moreover, it is probable that the Apabhraṃśa seen in some verses of the *Hevajra* is of the eastern variety. This is suggesred by the nom. sg. endings *-aho* and *-aha* in *kibiḍaho* in 2.4.6 and *hutāsanaha* in 2.4.67; see TAGARE 1987, p. 110–111. An investigation of the language of the Apabhraṃśa verses that are found in such Yoginītantras as the *Hevajra*, *Khasama*, *Catuṣpīṭha*, and *Ḍākārṇava*, in comparison with that of the *Dohā* collections of Kāṇha and Saraha, may be expected to shed more light on this question of provenance.

[388] See here p. 180.

[389] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, explaining the title with the prefixed honoric Śrī- when it occurs in the final colophon in the words *śrīcakrasaṃvaranāmni mahāyoginītantrarāje* 'in the great king among the Yoginītantras called *śrīcakrasaṃvara*' in the final colophon: *śrīḥ puṇyajñānasaṃbhāraḥ | cakraṃ dharmacakram | śrīmac cakraṃ śrīcakram | tena kāpathāt sattvānāṃ manaḥ saṃvṛṇotīti śrīcakrasaṃvaraḥ śrīherukaḥ | tadabhidhāyitvāt tantram api tathocyate* 'The word Śrī- 'glory' denotes the accumulating of [both] merit and gnosis. The word -cakra- 'wheel' refers to the wheel of the Dharma. It is prefixed by Śrī to express the fact that it [, that is to say, the teaching of the Buddha,] entails this [provisioning with both merit and gnosis]. Heruka is called Śrīcakrasaṃvara [here] because he restrains [*saṃvṛṇotīti saṃvaraḥ*] by means of this [wheel, in the sense that he restrains] the minds of living beings from the false path. [This] Tantra has the same name because it is that which refers to him'.

[390] Ratnākaraśānti, *Mahāmāyāṭīkā* on 23d: *śaṃvaraṃ sukhavaraṃ mahāsukham* '[*śam* means 'bliss' and *-varam* 'best'. So] *śaṃvaram* means 'the best bliss' (*sukhavaram*) [, i.e.] 'the Great Bliss' (*mahāsukham*)'. The same analysis is tacitly given in such parallel expressions as *ḍākinījālasatsukham* in *Saṃvarodaya* 3.6d and 26.10cd; and *Vajraḍāka* 1.1cd: *sarvaḍākinīmayaḥ sattvo vajraḍākaḥ param sukham*; 1.12cd, 1.50,1.71cd: *sarvaḍākinīsamāyogavajraḍākaḥ paraṃ sukham*.

[391] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on 1.2: *ḍākinī śūnyatā. jālam upāyaḥ | jālena hi matsyādibandhanasiddhiḥ | upāyena hi kleśamīnādir niyamyākiṃcitkaraḥ kriyate | tābhyāṃ śaṃ sukham avadyebhyo bahiṣkṛtya vṛṇotīti ḍākinījālaśaṃvaraḥ* '[The meaning of the name] Ḍākinījālaśaṃvara [applied to Heruka here] is 'he who protects (*-varaḥ* [*vṛṇotīti varaḥ*]) bliss (*śam*) by means of the Ḍākinī and the Net (*jālam*)'. The term Ḍākinī [here] means ['Emptiness',] 'the fact that [all things] are void of [intrinsic reality]' (*śūnyatā*); and the term 'Net' refers to the method (*upāyaḥ*) [, namely the compassion (*karuṇā*) that must accompany awareness of that Emptiness]. It is called a net [metaphorically]. For by using a net one succeeds in catching fish and other creatures. [Likewise] by employing the method [that is compassion] one restrains and so renders incapable of activity the 'fish and other creatures' that are the afflictions (*kleśāḥ*)[, namely attachment, hatred and the rest]. He protects bliss by means of these two[, emptiness and compassion,] in the sense that through these he protects it from [those] defects'.

[392] See, e.g., Hemacandra, *Anekārthasaṃgraha*, *Pariśiṣṭakāṇḍa* 21a: *śaṃ kalyāṇe sukhe 'tha*; Vardhamāna, *Gaṇaratnamahodadhivṛtti*, p. 39, on 1.15: *śaṃ duḥkhopaśame*; Yāska, *Nighaṇṭubhāṣya*, p. 521 (on *Ṛgveda* 5.4.5: *śaṃ no bhavantu vājinaḥ*): *sukhāḥ no bhavantu vājinaḥ*.

[393] *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba*, f. 154r6–7 (1.10): *shaṃ zhes bya ba bde bar bshad | sangs rgyas kun gyi bde chen yin | sgyu ma thams cad rab sbyor ba | mchog tu bde bas bde ba'i mchog* (*sukhaṃ śam iti vikhyātaṃ sarvabauddhaṃ mahāsukham | sarvajālasamāyogaḥ sukhavareṇa śaṃvaraḥ*) 'The word *śam* means 'bliss'. the Great Bliss of all the Buddhas. He is Śaṃvara because of [the fact that he possesses] the highest degree of [this] bliss'. The Sanskrit of the first half of this verse is supported by its citation by Vilāsavajra while explaining the epithet *mahāsukhaḥ* in his *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*, f. 57v1–2: *mahāsukha iti śrīśaṃvare | tatra mahāsukha iti yat tāthāgatam anāsravaṃ sukhaṃ tan mahāsukha ity ucyate | tatraivoktaṃ sukhaṃ śam iti vikhyātaṃ sarvabauddhaṃ mahāsukham iti*.

However, these are not the only views. Jayabhadra, commenting on 1.2 of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, takes the same expression to be *Ḍākinījālasaṃvara*, understanding it to refer to the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself and explaining it as 'The Concealment of the Array of Ḍākinīs', deriving the last element of the compound from *saṃvṛ-* 'to envelop';[396] and while the Tibetans usually render the

---

The first Pāda is also supported by Bhavabhaṭṭa, who quotes it without attribution, when explaining *ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram* in *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.2: *śaṃ sukham iti cākhyātam iti vacanāt*.

[394] Yoginījālaśaṃvara in this text is a form of Bhairava and the term refers by extension to his Mantra and the associated system of practice (*vratam*). See *Picumata* f. 251r5–v1 (56.4c–6b): *śṛṇu devi pravakṣyāmi sarvayogiprasādhanam | yāgamantrasamopetaṃ yoginījālaśaṃvaram | yena vijñātamātreṇa trailokye khecarīpadam | āsādya krīḍate mantrī kulasiddhisamanvitaḥ* 'Listen, O Devī. I shall teach you about Yoginījālaśaṃvara together with the deities with whom he is to be worshipped (*yāga-*) and his Mantra, as the means of propitiating the Yoginīs. As soon as the Mantra adept has mastered this he will reach the domain of the Khecarīs and move freely through the triple universe, possessing [all] the supernatural powers of the [Yoginī] clans'.

[395] *Picumata* f. 251v2–3 (56.12–13b): *samūhaṃ jālam ity uktaṃ yoginīnāṃ mahodayam | śaṃ sukhaṃ vara dātṛtvā<t> *samūhatvavivakṣayā* (*samūhatva* em. : *samūhatvaṃ* Cod.) *| * yogeśiyogabhāvasthaṃ* (*yogeśiyoga* conj. : yogayogīśa Cod.) *yoginījālaśaṃvaram | mantraṃ tu kathitaṃ devi bhairavasyāmitātmakam* 'The expression Yoginījāla [in Yoginījālaśaṃvara] means the exalted totality of the Yoginīs, *jālam* 'net' denoting 'multitude' [here]. The *śaṃ* of -śaṃvara means 'bliss' (*sukham*). The Yoginījālaśaṃvara[mantra] is so named because it is the bestower (*-vara*) of that bliss, [*-vara-* being formed as an agent noun from the verb *vṛ-* 'to give']. It is the granter of this bliss to the Yoginījāla in as much as it is located in the inner state of *the Yoga of the Yogeśvarīs, the plurality of these being intended in the sense of their totality (conj.). The Mantra of Bhairava [that bears this name] is infinite [in its power]'.

[396] Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on 1.1–2b (*athāto rahasyaṃ vakṣye samāsān na tu vistarāt | śrīherukasaṃyogaṃ sarvakāmārthasādhakam | uttarād api cottaraṃ ḍākinījālasaṃvaram* 'Next I shall teach the secret, in brief rather than at length, the congress of Śrīheruka, the accomplisher of all desires, the *Ḍākinījālasaṃvara*, higher even than the higher'): *uttarād api cottaram iti deśyadeśakayor abhedāt | yāny uttaratantrāṇi samājādīni teṣām apy uttaratvād uktaṃ | ḍākinījālasaṃvaram iti | ḍākinyaḥ sarvās tricakravyavasthitāḥ | tāsāṃ jālaḥ samūhas tasya saṃvaraḥ | saṃvaraṇaṃ gopanam ity arthaḥ* 'It is referred to as higher even than the higher because it is higher even than the Tantras [of the Yogottara class] headed by the [*Guhya*]*samāja*, which are 'higher' because the difference between teacher and the taught is absent [in them]. As for [the title] *Ḍākinījālasaṃvara*, it means the concealing of the net, that is to say, of the totality of all the Ḍākinīs that are established

Cakra- name 'Khor lo sdom pa and so support the form Cakrasaṃvara, we also find 'Khor lo bde mchog in their translations, which supports the alternative Cakraśaṃvara.[397]

The reason for this inconstancy is evidently that *śa* and *sa* are both pronounced as *śa* in Bengali, as they were in the Māgadhī Prakrit of the dramatists.[398] Consequently, instead of attempting to decide which form is correct we should recognize that for the east-Indian followers of this tradition there was in effect only one word here (*śaṃvara* / *saṃvara*), which could be understood either as 'the highest (*-vara-* [Tib. *mchog*]) bliss (*śam* [Tib. *bde*])' or as 'fusion' and the like by derivation from the verbal root *vṛ* preceded by the preverb *sam*. That this was the case is demonstrated by a passage in the *Saṃvarodaya* in which the two semantic analyses, explaining *śaṃvara-* and *saṃvara-* respectively, are given for one and the same word.[399]

ŚAṂVARA/VAJRARUDRA AND VAJRAVĀRĀHĪ: THE TRANSFORMATION OF BHAIRAVA AND HIS CONSORT. What marks the new start seen in the Yoginītantras is a far more comprehensive adoption of the practices of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha texts, to the extent that there is little in the observances of these texts that does not draw on that source. Heruka is now paired with a lustful consort (Vajravārāhī in the Cakrasaṃvara texts and Nairātmyā in those of Hevajra), and in the case of the Cakrasaṃvara tradition, so are the principal Yoginīs of his retinue, a feature that matches the practice of the Vidyāpīṭha's *Picumata* (*Brahmayāmala*). Moreover, in the case of the tradition elaborated on the basis of the *Laghuśaṃvara* the icon of Heruka has several blatantly obvious features of the iconography of Śiva (/Bhairava) in addition to those manifest in

---

in the three circuits [of the Maṇḍala of Cakrasaṃvara], *saṃvaraḥ* being derived from the verb *saṃvṛ-* 'to conceal' in the sense of the action of concealing'.

[397] In the DT *'khor lo sdom pa* (*cakrasaṃvara-*) occurs about 250 times and *'khor lo bde mchog* (*cakraśaṃvara-*) about 100; see, e.g., DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *cha*, f. 242v3 (*'khor lo bde mchog gi gzugs can*); vol. *ja*, f. 58v7 (*'khor lo bde mchog gi rgyud*), and f. 102r7 (*'khor lo bde mchog gi sngags*).

[398] See, for Māgadhī, Vararuci, *Prākṛtaprakāśa* 11.2: *ṣasoḥ śaḥ* '*ś* is used in place of both *ṣ* and *s*'. Generally in Middle and New Indo-Aryan the three Sanskrit sibilants have been reduced to *s*. It has been reported that in the Tantric Buddhist *Dohā* texts, composed in what has been called Eastern Apabhraṃśa, *ś* has been preserved in derivatives of words that have it in Sanskrit (TAGARE 1987, p. 77). It is true that a few such forms are found in the manuscripts (SHAHIDULLAH 1928, p. 37), but there are many cases in which *ś* does not appear, such as *suṇṇa* for Skr. *śūnya*. It is likely that the occasional distinction between *ś* and *s* was learned window-dressing and that both consonants were pronounced *ś*.

[399] *Saṃvarodaya* 3.17c–19b: *saṃvaraṃ sarvabuddhānām evaṃkāre pratiṣṭhitam || kāyāvākcetasāṃ karma sarvākāraikasaṃvaram | saṃvaraṃ sukhavaraṃ bodhir avācyam anidarśanam || rahasyaṃ sarvabuddhānāṃ milanaṃ saṃvaraṃ varam.*

the Heruka of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*. He is black-bodied, and has twelve arms and four faces, with three eyes in each. He stands in the warrior pose with a Vajra and a Vajra-topped bell in his two principal hands, holding the bleeding hide of a flayed elephant over his back with his two uppermost hands, and in the remaining eight a rattle-drum (*ḍamaruḥ*), a battle-axe, a chopping knife, and a trident, a skull-topped staff (*khaṭvāṅgaḥ*), a skull-bowl (*kapālam*) filled with blood, a lasso (*pāśaḥ*), and the severed head of the god Brahmā, wearing a long garland of fifty bleeding human heads around his neck, adorned with five ornaments of human bone and the ash of cremation-pyres smeared over his limbs—these, the bone ornaments and ash, are the Six Mudrās of the Kāpālikas—, with a tiger skin around his waist, a brahmanical cord in the form of a snake (*nāgayajñopavītaḥ*), and a chaplet of skulls (*kapālamālā*) above his forehead, his hair arranged in a high crown-like mass of ascetic's braids (*jaṭāmukuṭaḥ*) adorned at the front with two crossed Vajras (*viśvavajram*) and the new moon. His consort Vajravārāhī stands before him in sexual union, with Heruka holding her to his chest with the hands that hold the Vajra and the Vajra-bell crossed at the wrists behind her back. She is red, one-faced, and two-armed, naked but for a filigree of fragments of human bone adorning her hips (*asthimekhalā*), her right arm raised aloft holding a chopping-knife, with her index finger extended in a gesture of threatening the wicked, and her left arm, wrapped around Heruka's neck, holding to their mouths a skull bowl full of human blood and entrails, wearing a garland of fifty desiccated heads and the five Kāpālika bone-ornaments, laughing, and intoxicated by lust. They are surrounded by a retinue of thirty-six goddesses termed Yoginīs, Ḍākinīs, Vīreśvarīs, or Vīriṇīs visualized in the same Kāpālika style, in concentric circuits of four, twenty-four, and eight, the twenty-four embracing Vīra consorts and worshipped as residing in twenty-four sacred sites covering the whole subcontinent, from Uḍḍiyāna in the north to Rāmeśvara at India's southern tip, from Sindhu in the west to Devīkoṭṭa in the east. The whole is surrounded by a ring of eight cremation grounds.[400]

The features of Śiva's iconography evident here are the trident, the third eye, the new moon on the piled up braids, the tiger-skin lower garment, the multiple faces and arms, the skull-bowl, the skull-staff, the bleeding elephant hide, the severed head of Brahmā, the snake as brahmanical thread, the sharp fangs, the chaplet of skulls, his dwelling in the cremation grounds, and the ashes

---

[400] This description of Heruka and Vajravārāhī follows that given by Jayabhadra in his *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 109, on *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.10. for the iconography of the Yoginīs and Vīras see Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* on *Laghuśaṃvara*, Paṭala 4 (vol. 1, pp. 44–47). See also *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, pp. 26–29.

on his limbs. All these had entered Śiva's iconography long before the formation of the Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle. Śiva's trident appears on seals and intaglios during the Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇo-Sassanian periods in Gandhāra and Afghanistan.[401] The third eye appears in sculptures of Śiva from Mathurā around the beginning of the third century; and the ascetic's piled braids and the new moon upon them appear there and elsewhere from the beginning of the fifth;[402] and all these characteristics, the trident in his hand, the third eye, the ascetic's braids, and the new moon, are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*,[403] as are his tiger-skin, his multiple faces and arms, his skull-bowl, his skull-staff, his brahmanical thread in the form of a snake, his sharp fangs, his garland of skulls, and his living in the cremation grounds smeared with ashes from its funeral pyres.[404] His wearing a bleeding elephant hide is also a commonplace by that time, being mentioned along with his crematorial characteristics in the works of the poet Kālidāsa.[405] As for the severed head of Brahmā, this too derives from a well-known Śaiva myth which though not found in the *Mahābhārata* in the text common to all the regional versions,[406] does appear in the *Skandapurāṇa*-

---

[401] For a recent analysis of Śiva images in the subcontinent, including those on coins, from the first century B.C. to the end of the Kuṣāṇa period, see GHOSE 2002, pp. 70–96.

[402] KREISEL 1986 (Mathura, c. 400), p. 82; BAKKER 1997, pp. 149–151 (Mansar, c. 400–450).

[403] *Mahābhārata* 3.8.111a (*triśūlapāṇeḥ*); 13.14.119 (*bālendumukuṭaṃ … tribhir netraiḥ kṛtoddyotaṃ*), 12.122.24b (*śūlajaṭādharaḥ*), 7.172.59c (*jaṭāmaṇḍalacandramauliṃ*).

[404] See, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 13.127.18a (*vyāghracarmāmbaradharaḥ*); 14.8.30d (*mahādevaṃ caturmukham*), 13.14.116c (*aṣṭādaśabhujaṃ sthāṇuṃ*), 14.8.28a (*virūpākṣaṃ daśabhujaṃ*), 13.17.40a (*daśabāhus tv animiṣo*); 12.36.2c (*kapālapāṇiḥ khaṭvāṅgī*), 10.7.4d (*khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇaṃ*); 13.15.11cd (*tīkṣṇadaṃṣṭraṃ … vyālayajñopavītam*), 14.8.21a (*tīkṣṇadaṃṣṭrāya karālāya*); 10.6.33c (*kapālamālinaṃ*); 10.7.4a (*śmaśānavāsinaṃ*); 13.14.153c (*śuklabhasmāvaliptāya*) .

[405] *Meghadūta* 36c: *hara paśupater ārdranāgājinecchāṃ* 'Remove Śiva's desire for his [blood-]wet elephant hide'; *Kumārasambhava* 5.67d: *gajājinaṃ śoṇitabinduvarṣi ca* '[his] elephant hide that showers drops of blood'; 5.77b: *trilokanāthaḥ pitṛsadmagocaraḥ* 'The Lord of the Three Worlds frequents cremation grounds'; 5.69c, 5.79b: *citābhasmarajaḥ* 'the ash-dust of funeral pyres'; and 5.71b: *kapālinaḥ* 'decked with skulls'. Rudra/Śiva frequently has the epithet *kṛttivāsas-* 'wearer of the hide' in the *Mahābhārata*. The *Matsyapurāṇa* (Paṭala 153) relates that this is the hide of the elephant demon Gajāsura killed by Śiva in a great battle between the gods and the Asuras. How the elephant hide was understood when incorporated into the iconography of Heruka is not stated in most instances of its mention. But in two Kalpas in the *Abhidhānottara*, those of Samayaśaṃvara and the Heruka of the *ekavīravidhānam*, it is said to be that of the elephantine Śaiva-brahmanical deity Gaṇapati (B f. 34v1: *aparabhujadvayena gaṇapaticarmāmbara**dharam* (corr. : *dharā* Cod.) and (B f. 40v2–3: *aparabhujadvayena gaṇapaticarmāmbaradharaḥ*).

[406] There is a reference to it in a supplementary passage of 26 verses inserted within a

Ambikākhaṇḍa,[407] probably composed in the sixth or perhaps the first half of the seventh century.[408] Other features in addition to these, namely the garland of severed or desiccated heads, the chopping knife, the rattle-drum, the Kāpālika bone-ornaments, the consort, the skull-bowl full of blood and entrails, the retinue of Yoginīs, their pairing with Vīra consorts, the sacred sites, the theriocephalic gate-guardians, and the encircling cremation grounds, are commonplaces of the iconography of the Vidyāpīṭha texts. Only the Vajras place a Buddhist seal on the icon.

The image, then, has every appearance of representing a Buddhist transformation of Śiva himself in his Bhairava aspect. Indeed in his commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvara* Jayabhadra refers to this Heruka as Vajrarudra, that is to say, as Śiva/Bhairava converted and liberated by assimilation into the essence of Buddha-hood,[409] thereby definitively surrendering and transcending his Śaiva identity. In clear expression of this transcendence Heruka/Vajrarudra and Vajravārāhī are depicted and visualized standing on the sprawling, terrified bodies of a black Bhairava and a red, emaciated Kālarātri, their own pre-Buddhist identities as the principal deities of the Vidyāpīṭha.[410]

---

hymn to Śiva (13.14.150–166) after 13.14.153 in the Maithilī and Bengali versions, the Devanāgarī version of the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha, in several manuscripts of the composite version, and the Kumbhakonam edition (*Anuśāsanaparvan*, Appendix I, no. 6, l. 45): *brahmaśiropahartāya* '[obeisance] to the remover of Brahmā's head'.

[407] 5.1–63 (ed. Adriaensen, Bakker, and Isaacson, pp. 132–141).

[408] See here p. 51.

[409] Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on Paṭala 12: *kṛtapūrvasevo mantrirāṭ iti vajrarudrayogavān* 'When the king among Mantra adepts has completed the preparatory service (*pūrvasevā*), that is to say, when he has achieved a state of complete identification with Vajrarudra ...'; and on Paṭala 27: *jñānahetujam iti | jñānasya prakarṣaparyantam | tasya hetuḥ kāraṇaṃ bhagavān vajrarudraḥ | tasmāj jāto bhavatīty arthaḥ* '*jñānahetujam* means born from the cause of knowledge, where knowledge is wisdom's ultimate degree and its cause is Lord Vajrarudra'. Vajrarudra appears already in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* in a passage that associates the nine dramatic sentiments (*rasāḥ*) with Vajrasattva, Tathāgata, Vajradhara, Lokeśvara, Vajrasūrya, Vajrarudra, Śākyamuni, Ārali (or perhaps Āralli), and Śāśvata (Vairocana) respectively. Vajrarudra's is the sentiment of terror (*bhayānakarasaḥ*) and it is probable therefore that we should understand Vajrarudra to be Heruka. *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba* f. 128r3: *rdo rje sems dpa' steg pa la | dpa' la dpa' bo de bzhin gshegs | rdo rje 'dzin pa snying rje la | rgod pa 'jig rten dbang phyug mchog | rdo rje nyi ma khro ba la | rdo rje drag po 'jigs pa la | shā kya thub pa mi sdug la | ngo mtshar la ni a ra li | rab tu zhi la sangs rgyas rtag* (**śṛṅgāre vajrasattvo hi vīre caiva tathāgataḥ | vajradhṛk karuṇāyāṃ tu hāsye caiva lokeśvaraḥ | vajrasūryas tathā raudre vajrarudro bhayānake | śākyamunis tu bībhatse ārallir adbhute tathā | praśānte śāśvataś caiva*).

[410] Kālarātri here is the fearsome emaciated goddess variously called Carcā, Carcikā, Cāmuṇḍā, and Karṇamoṭī; see here p. 231.

The Rise of the Goddess to Independence. Here Heruka's consort is visibly his dependent: while he has four faces and twelve arms she has only one and two. But in the subsequent development of this tradition we find a strongly Śākta tendency to elevate her to equality with Heruka and eventually to superiority, just as occurred in the development of the Vidyāpīṭha.[411] Thus in certain other Kalpas in which Heruka is united with Vajravārāhī at the centre of the Maṇḍala her status is raised by endowing her with four faces and four or more arms. This is the case in the Kalpa of the sixth Paṭala of the *Abhidhānottara*, which teaches what it calls the *ekavīravidhānam*, the procedure in which the two deities alone are worshipped as 'solitary heroes' (*ekavīra-*), that is to say, without the the retinue of the thirty-six Yoginīs and twenty-four Vīras. Here Heruka has twelve arms and Vajravārāhī four, holding a blood-filled skull-bowl, a chopping-knife raised aloft with the gesture of threat, a rattle-drum, and a skull-staff. But both have four faces.[412] In the seventh Paṭala a two-faced, six-armed Vajrasattva transforms into a six-faced, twelve-armed Heruka Mañjuvajramahāsukha accompanied by a Vajravārāhī who has the same number of faces and arms and holds the same attributes in her hands. Brahmā's severed head is absent here, but Brahmā himself is not: his flayed skin takes the place of the elephant hide; and in place of a tiger skin we see that of Bhairava.[413] We see the same equality in the tenth Paṭala, where both Heruka and Vajravārāhī are five-faced and ten-armed,[414] and in the eleventh, where a six-faced, twelve-armed Heruka wearing the flayed skin of Rudra on his back embraces a twelve-armed Vajravārāhī;[415] and in the twentieth, in which a red five-faced and twelve-armed Heruka embraces a Vajravārāhī with same colour and hand-attributes.[416]

---

[411] See SANDERSON 1988, pp. 668–678.

[412] *Abhidhānottara* B f. 40r3: *athānya<ṃ> saṃpravakṣyāmi ekavīravidhānakam | ...*(f. 40r6) *śrīherukam ātmānaṃ bhāvayet | caturmukhaṃ dvādaśabhujam ...*(f. 41r1–3) *tasyāgrato ālikālisthitā bhagavatī vajravārāhī raktavarṇā caturvaktrā caturbhujā trinetrā muktakeśī | nagnā khaṇḍamaṇḍitamekhalā | vāme bhujāliṅganakapālaṃ ca duṣṭamārādyasṛgbodhicittaparipūrṇaṃ dakṣiṇe tarjanīvajrakartikā | aparabhujadvaye ḍamarukhaṭvāṅga<m>*. The retinue is absent only in the sense that the deities are not positioned around Heruka and Vajravārāhī. Instead the twenty-four Yoginī-Vīra couples are installed from the head of Heruka down to his feet, and the four Yoginīs of the innermost circuit and the eight of the outermost are installed in the twelve objects in his hands.

[413] *Abhidhānottara* B f. 50v5–6: *tatparāvṛttyā sadvajraṃ vajrasattvaṃ vibhāvayet | trimukhaṃ ṣaḍbhujaṃ caiva trinetraṃ karuṇārasam | ...*(ff. 52v5–53r3) *anena codito nātho bījam utpannam uttamam | kuṅkumākāravarṇābhaṃ vajracihnasamutthitam | *ṣaṇmukhaṃ* (corr. : *khanmukhaṃ* Cod.) *dvādaśabhujaṃ vārāhyāsamalaṃkṛtam | *ṣaḍa(?)vīramahāvīraṃ ardhaparyaṅkasaṃsthitam | trinetraṃ hasitaṃ raudraṃ karālaṃ bībhatsaṃ *lelihānanaṃ* (em. : *lelihānalaṃ* Cod.) *karuṇārasam | bhairavaṃ kālarātriṃ ca pādākrāntatale sthitam | athavālīḍhasaṃsthānakṛtayogaṃ *mahādbhutam* (conj. : *mahadbhūtaṃ* Cod.) *| ...*(f. 53r5–v2) **brahmaṇaḥ* (em. : *brāhmaṇa* Cod.) *kṛttim utkṛttya pṛṣṭhaprāvṛtavigraham | raudrabhairavacarmeṇa *kaṭim* (corr. : *kaṭir* Cod.) *āveṣṭya saṃsthitam | kapālakhaṭvāṅgadhara<ṃ> asi-utpalaśaradhāriṇam | aṅkuśapāśaḍamarumuṇḍacāpadharaṃ tathā | tadvaktrāyudhavārāhyā mahārāgapade sthitā | jaṅghādvayasamāśliṣṭā mahāsurata*sundarī* (corr. : *suṃdharā* Cod.) *| muṇḍasragdāmadehogrā ṣaṇmudrācihnabhūṣitā | evaṃ bhāvayate yogī mañjuvajramahāsukham.*

The literature also teaches Kalpas in which Vajravārāhī is worshipped in her own right in the centre of a circuit or circuits of Yoginīs. She may be one-faced and two-armed, as when she is worshipped as Heruka's consort, standing in the warrior pose at the centre of the circle of the eight cremation grounds, naked, red and menstruating, her face contorted with anger, with large fangs, three red eyes, wearing a chaplet of five skulls framed by two rows of Vajras, with crossed Vajras on her unbound hair, wearing a garland of fifty heads, which are not desiccated, as they are when she is Heruka's consort, but, like his, freshly severed and dripping blood. She holds aloft a red Vajra in her left hand with her index extended, a skull-bowl full of blood in her right, and a long white skull-staff resting in the crook of her left arm, She may possess, as before, only the first five of the six Mudrās; but some emphasized her pre-eminence by requiring that since she is now the central deity of the Maṇḍala she should also be smeared with ashes. She is surrounded by the thirty-six Yoginīs, disposed as in the Maṇḍala of Heruka, but with the difference that the Yoginīs, like her, wear garlands of freshly severed heads,[417] or by only the inner circuit of four, or with no retinue

---

[414] *Abhidhānottara* B ff. 71r3–72v5: *vajrasattvaparāvṛttyā herukatvaṃ vibhāvayet | pañcānanaṃ daśabhujaṃ vārāhyāsamalaṃkṛtam* ...(f. 72v4–5) *tadvarṇabhuja*saṃsthānā* (corr. : *saṃsthānaṃ* Cod.) *muktakeśī tu nagnikā vyāghracarmanivasanā khaṇḍamaṇḍitamekhalā | kapālamālinī raudrī karuṇārāgasuvihvalā.*

[415] *Abhidhānottara* B ff. 79v3–80r6: *ṣaḍvaktraṃ vīraṃ bībhatsaṃ śṛṅgārahasitaṃ raudraṃ lelihānanam | ṣaṇmudrāmudritaṃ dehaṃ nānābharaṇamaṇḍitam | vārāhyā *tu samāpannaṃ* (em. : *nusamāpannā* Cod.) *jānudvayasuveṣṭitam* ...(f. 80r2) *rudracarmāmbaradharaṃ* ...(f. 80r5–6) *tadvarṇabhujasaṃsthānā muktakeśī tu nagnikā.*

[416] *Abhidhānottara* B f. 113r3–v4: *herukākāram ātmānaṃ ḍākinīcayaparāvṛtam | mahograṃ raktavapuṣaṃ pañcajñānodbhavodbhavam | raktaṃ nīlaṃ ca haritaṃ pītaṃ śāntasitordhvakam | trinetraṃ dvādaśabhujam ālīḍhapadasaṃsthitam |* ...(f. 113v3–4) *agrato vajravārāhyā tadvarṇāyudhadhāriṇī.*

[417] This is the main Kalpa taught in the *Abhisamayamañjarī* (pp. 131, l. 9–133, l. 1). I propose the following emendations and corrections to the text of the published edition: for *mithyā dṛṣṭiprahāṇā vikṛtaikānanāṃ* (p. 131, l. 15) read *mithyādṛṣṭiprahāṇād vikṛtaikānanāṃ* ; for *cakrikuṇḍalakaṇṭhikārucakakhaṭvāṅgamekhalākhyapañcamudrādharām* (p. 131, l. 18) read *cakrīkuṇḍalakaṇṭhikārucakakhaṇḍāṅkamekhalākhyapañcamudrādharām*; for *iti kecit | maṇḍalanāyikātvena ṣaṇmudritām ity eke* read *iti maṇḍalanāyikātvena ṣaṇmudritām ity eke* (p. 132, l. 3); for *vajrāvalīdvayamadhyākṛta-* read *vajrāvalīdvayamadhyīkṛta-* (p. 132, l. 9); and for *aṣṭavijñānāṃ nairātmyāsvarūpatvena* read *aṣṭavijñānānāṃ nairātmyasvarūpatvena* (p. 132, l. 12).

at all.[418]

There are other forms of this kind, among which one is particulary worthy of note because it shows her four-faced and twelve-armed like Heruka himself, his equal as it were or, rather, the fusion of both within her, since her fanged face is divided down the middle into a male half on her right and a female half on her left (*ardhanārīśvaramukhā*), a Śākta reflex of the well-known Ardhanārīśvara image of Śiva. She has the same hand-attributes as the twelve-armed Heruka except that the battle-axe and trident have gone, an elephant-goad has taken the latter's place. The hand that held the skull-staff now holds the skull-bowl, the skull-staff rests in the crook of that arm, and the two hands that are now free form the flame gesture (*jvālāmudrā*) on her forehead. The place of the elephant hide is taken by the flayed skin of a man. She holds the Vajra and bell in her crossed principal hands and turns them over each other in the gesture known as the revolving lotus (*kamalāvartaḥ*). She is red, naked, and intoxicated with passion, adorned with all six Mudrās, the new moon and crossed Vajras on her hair, a chaplet of skulls above her forehead, and the bone-filigree around her hips. She dances wildly in the centre of her retinue, visualized at the moment that she stands with her left leg on the ground flexed at the knee and her right foot raised and placed on the inside of her left thigh with the right knee turned out. She is surrounded by the thirty-six Yoginīs with the addition of the four goddesses Māmakī, Locanā, Tārā, and Pāṇḍaravāsin of the *Guhyasamāja* Yogottara system. The four innermost goddesses have the heads of a lion, sow, elephant, and horse, and hold in their four hands the skull-bowl, skull-staff, head of Brahmā, and chopping-knife. Outside them are the four Yogottara goddesses, each at the centre of a lotus with six petals, six-armed and adorned with the six Mudrās. They hold in one of their two principal hands the symbol of the Tathāgata-family to which each belongs (a Vajra, a wheel, two crossed Vajras, and a lotus respectively) and in the other a bell, turning them over each other. In the other hands they hold a skull-bowl, the head of Brahmā, and a rattle-drum, with a skull-staff in the crook of the principal left arm. The twenty-four Yoginīs of the sacred sites are placed in groups of six on the petals of these lotuses. They are four-armed, and hold the symbol of the Tathāgata-family of the Yogottara goddess on whose lotus they are placed, a skull-bowl, a skull-staff, and a rattle-drum. They wear chaplets of skulls and show only five of the six seals. Like the central goddess they are half male and half female (*ardhanārīśvaryaḥ*). All the goddesses in the Maṇḍala up to this point are naked and dancing. Outside them is the final circuit of eight Yoginīs. The four in the four doors of the Maṇḍala, with the heads of a crow, owl, dog, and sow, stand naked in the warrior-pose, dwarfish, with squinting eyes. The four in the corners have the heads of a buffalo, an ass, a camel, and a horse, and like all but the door-guardians, are visualized in the dance posture. All eight of these outer Yoginīs have the five Mudrās and chaplets of skulls, and are four-armed, holding a skull-bowl, the head of Brahmā in their left hands, and a chopping-knife and rattle-drum in their right. [419]

---

[418] *Abhisamayamañjarī*, p. 142, ll. 13–19.

The cult of the independent goddess (Bhagavatī) appears to have been a particularly vigorous development, to judge from the exceptionally large number of variant forms that emerged.[420] Within the earlier scriptural literature the *Abhidhānottara* contains several sections devoted to Sādhanas of Vajravārāhi;[421] in the *Herukābhyudaya* eleven of its forty-four chapters are devoted to her Mantras and their procedures;[422] and the section of the Tenjur devoted to the Cakrasaṃvara cycle (Tōh. 1403–1606) contains over sixty texts devoted to the varieties of her cult as Vajravārāhī or Vajrayoginī (Tōh. 1541–1606). Śākyarakṣita, a pupil of Abhayākaragupta (1064–1125), after detailing the Sādhana of several of her forms in his *Abhisamayamañjarī*,[423] adds that these are but a few of the many that were current in his time:[424]

> So it should be understood that in accordance with the various mentalities of those requiring to be trained there are countless traditions of the Goddess such as this, transmitted through the generations from teacher to pupil in accordance with the [founding] instruction of various Siddhas. What I have shown here is no more than an indicative fraction of the whole.

This Śākta trend is also evidenced in the practice of the Newars of the Kathmandu valley down modern times. For their ceremony of initiation before the Maṇḍala of Cakrasaṃvara is followed on the final day by initiation before the Maṇḍala of Vajradevī (Vajravārāhī).[425] Nor was this confined to the subcontinent. In Tibet too Vajravārāhī/Vajrayoginī rose to a position of special honour, notably in the bKa' brgyud and Sa skya traditions, but also in later times among the dGe lug pas, rNying ma pas, and Bon pos.[426]

There are other compilations, scriptural and secondary, that survive in Nepalese manuscripts but did not reach Tibet, which attest her prominence in the last phase of the Mantranaya: the *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, of about three thousand verses, which interweaves the *Ḍākārṇava* and the *Saṃvarodaya*, and incorporates thirteen non-scriptural Sādhana texts of Vajravārāhī and one of Nairātmyā, the consort of Hevajra;[427] the closely related *Yoginījāla*, of about one thousand verses; and the collection of forty-six Sādhanas of Vajrayoginī known as the *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā*.[428] Moreover, two texts devoted to the cult of this goddess were added to the canon of scripture received by the Tibetans. The first is the *Vārāhyabhyudayatantra*, a short work of three hundred verses counted among the explanatory Tantras of the *Laghuśaṃvara* but consisting almost entirely of passages lifted from the *Saṃpuṭodbhava*, the *Abhidhānottara*, and the *Saṃvarodaya*;[429] and the second is the *Vidyādharīkramavajrayoginīsādhana*, which appears in the Kanjur (Tōh. 380) between the major Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle and those of contested authenticity,[430] included perhaps, in spite of its genre, because it states in its opening words that it is part of the otherwise unattested *Mahāmāyājālordhvajaṭottaratantra*, which, it claims, was extracted from the *Trilakṣa*, that it to say, from the vast mythical Ur-text of this cycle, the *Trilakṣābhidhāna*.[431]

---

[419] This form is taught in *Abhidhānottara* ff. 63v1–70r4 (Paṭala 9 in the enumeration of this manuscript), from which it entered the *Vārāhyabhyudaya*. A lightly adjusted version of this Kalpa is found in the collection of Sādhanas of Vajravārāhī/Vajrayoginī that came to bear the title *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā* in the colophons of later manuscripts; see ENGLISH 2002, pp. 54–59.

[420] See ENGLISH 2002 for an illustrated survey of these variants.

[421] Paṭala 12/9: Vārāhī Vajrayoginī (4-faced, 12-armed; *ardhanārīśvarīmukhā*); 22/19: Mṛtasaṃjīvanī (4-faced or 8-faced, 16-armed); 36/33: Vajravārāhī (3-faced and 6-armed or 6-faced and 12-armed, surrounded by Guhyottamā etc.); 37/34: Vajravārāhī surrounded by Yāminī etc.

[422] Paṭalas 6, 8–11, 23–24, 29–31, and 34.

[423] The *Abhisamayamañjarī* is ascribed to Śubhākaragupta in its sole edition. This is an error and goes against the evidence of the colophons of the manuscripts (ENGLISH 2002, p. 357, n. 6).

[424] *Abhisamayamañjarī*, p. 152: *tad *evamādayaḥ* (em. : *evam ādāya* Ed.) *siddhopadeśaparamparāyātā vineyāśayabhedād anantā bhagavatyā āmnāyā boddhavyāḥ | diṅmātram idaṃ darśitam.*

[425] GELLNER 1992, pp. 273–279. His account of the ceremonies is based upon what he was told by the late Asha Kaji Vajracharya (*ibid.*, p. 273). That the Cakrasaṃvara initiation is followed by a separate Vajradevī initiation is confirmed by the evidence of the *Dīkṣāvidhi*, the manual in the Newari language that guides these rituals.

[426] See ENGLISH 2002, pp. xxii–xxvii.

[427] I have not yet undertaken a thorough analysis of the whole text. The interweaving that I report is of *Ḍākārṇava*, Paṭala 2–3 and *Saṃvarodaya* 2–3 in the first 3 Paṭalas. The *nidānavākyam* of the *Saṃvarodaya* is borrowed with the substitution of *vārāhībhageṣu* for the *Saṃvarodaya*'s *yoginībhageṣu*. I have noted the incorporation of the following Sādhana texts (identified here with the numbers ascribed in BHATTACHARYA's composite *Sādhanamālā*): 217–218 in Paṭala 36, 219–225 in Paṭala 37, 226–228 and 231 in Paṭala 38.

[428] This is the title under which the work has been catalogued in TSUKAMOTO *et al.* 1989, p. 285. It is based, I surmise, on the colophon of the last Sādhana in the collection, the *Ḍākinīguhyasamayasādhana* of Anaṅgayogin.

[429] The correspondences are as follows (S = *Saṃpuṭodbhava*; LŚ = *Laghuśaṃvara*; AU = *Abhidhānottara*; SU = *Saṃvarodaya*): 1.5–6b = S 6.3.26–27b; 1.17 = S 6.3.44c–45b; 1.18ab = S 6.3.45cd; 1.20cd ≈ S 6.3.46cd; 1.21 = S 6.3.47; 1.31 ≈ S 6.4.39; 1.33–43b = S 6.4.40–50; 2.15 = LŚ 1.19; 2.17c–18 = S 6.3.2–3b; 2.24–27b = S 6.3.3c–6; 2.27cd = S 6.2.2ab and 6.3.7ab; 2.28–29 = S 6.2.2c–4b; 2.31–33b = S 6.2.4c–6b; 2.34–40 = S 6.2.6c–14; 2.43–44d = S 6.2.15c–16; 3.1–2 = S 6.2.27–28; 5.8–14 = S 6.3.11–17; 6.1–2 = SU 7.1–2; 6.3b–6b = SU 7.14c–17; 6.6c–12b = S 6.3.35–40b; 6.14–19b = S 6.3.40c–45; 6.23–30 = AU 14.58–65; 7.3–7 = S 6.3.19c–24; 8.3–5 = AU 3.8c–11b; 8.17c–18 = AU 16.2–3b; 8.20b ≈ AU 16.3c; 8.20c = AU 16.4a; 8.21–22 ≈ AU 16.4b–5; 8.24–37 = AU 16.6–19; 8.39–41 = AU 16.23–25; 9.1c–5 = AU 4.3–7b; 9.6–17a = AU 4.9–20b; 9.21–39a = AU 4.24–38f; 9.39c–41b = AU 4.42c–44b; 9.41c–44 = AU 4.39–42b; 9.45–51 ('47', '48' and '50' are Mantras) = AU 4.44c–46 (with the same Mantras); 9.52ab = AU 4.51ab; 9.54ab = AU 4.51cd; 10 = AU 50.

Further evidence of this Śākta trend is seen in the views of the tradition concerning the nature of the revelation of this Ur-text, which, it was claimed, contained the required Buddhist preamble (*nidānavākyam*) that is lacking in the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself. Bhavabhaṭṭa, taking care not to claim direct access to that mythical source, saying only that his knowledge of its *nidānavākyam* has reached him through the lineage of his teachers (*guruparamparā*),[432] asserts that it reveals that the teacher of the Tantra was Bhagavān Mahāvajradhara, the requester his consort Bhagavatī Vajravārāhī, and the reciter Vajrapāṇi. These then, it follows for Bhavabhaṭṭa, are the *dramatis personae* of the *Laghuśaṃvara* too. But he reports a contrary view that Vajravārāhī was the teacher and Mahāvajradhara her pupil.[433] The imposition on the text of the claim that it is a dialogue between the deity and his goddess-consort brings it into line with the Śaiva scriptural literature of the Vidyāpīṭha. For there the Tantras take the form of Bhairava's teachings in answer to the questions of the Goddess (Devī/Bhairavī). In the explanatory Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle this model is made explicit in the *Vajraḍāka*, where Vajrasattva/Vajraḍāka teaches in response to the questions of Devī, and in the *Ḍākārṇava* and *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, where Vīreśvara responds to the questions of Vīreśvarī. But in the *Caturyoginīsaṃpuṭa*, another of the satellite Tantras of this cycle, the goddess Vajriṇī (Vajravārāhī) is the teacher and Vajrin (Heruka) the questioner.[434] That this inversion seen in the view reported by Bhavabhaṭṭa and in the *Caturyoginīsaṃpuṭa* is evidence of a more Śākta tendency within the tradition is obvious in itself, but it is confirmed by parallel practice in the most Śākta of the Śaiva scriptures, namely the *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva*, the *Kālīkulapañcaśataka*, and the *Manthānabhairava*.

THE ADOPTION OF THE VIDYĀPĪṬHA'S CARYĀ AND YOGA. As for the practice of initiates into this tradition, that too shows increased śāktization. For it now enacts the iconography of their deities through the adoption of the Vidyāpīṭha's Kāpālika mode of post-initiatory observance (*caryāvratam*). Buddhist Sādhakas now carry the skull-bowl (*kapālam*) and skull-staff (*khaṭvāṅgaḥ*), and put on the Mudrās of human bone and a brahmanical thread (*yajñopavītam*) made of the twisted hair of corpses or human sinew, and dust their bodies with ash.[435]

---

[430] In Sanskrit it is preserved as the twenty-first Sādhana in the *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā*, ff. 85r4–86r1.

[431] *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā*, f. 62r2: *athātaḥ saṃpravakṣyāmi trilakṣākṛṣṭamahāmāyājālordhvajaṭottaratantre* ....

[432] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, introduction: *mahāvajradharo deśakaḥ. ...bhagavatī vajravārāhy adhyeṣikā vajrapāṇiḥ saṃgātā ...vajravārāhyādhyeṣitasya bhagavataḥ prativacanam etad athāta ityādi ...adhyeṣikā devīti ko niyama iti cet | guruparamparāto hi śrūyate mūlatantre saivādhyeṣiketi | tata ihāpi saiveti gamyate.*

[433] Ibid., following the preceding citation: *bhagavān adhyeṣako bhagavatī deśiketi kecit. acintyarūpo hi tathāgatānām abhiprāyaḥ* 'Some say that the Lord [Mahāvajradhara] was the requester and the Goddess [Vajravārāhī] the teacher. For the intention of the Tathāgatas is inscrutable'.

[434] *Caturyoginīsaṃpuṭa* 2.15d–16: *atha sā vajriṇī devī idaṃ vākyam udīrayet | abhiṣekaṃ *sukathitaṃ* (conj. [=*legs par brjod nas* Tib.] : *kathitaṃ* Cod.) **gaṇamaṇḍalam eva ca* (conj. [=*tshogs kyi dkyil 'khor nyid dag dang* Tib.] : lacking in Cod.) | *aparaṃ kathayiṣyāmi devatānyāsam uttamam* 'Then that goddess Vajriṇī uttered the following words: I have fully explained the initiation rites and the Gaṇamaṇḍala. Next I shall explain the supreme [rite of the] installation of the deities'. For the verb *udīrayet* as a past indicative cf. Pali *udīrayi*.

[435] E.g. *Yogaratnamālā* on *Hevajra*, p. 155: *caryākāle gaṇacakrādau vā pañcānāṃ mudrāṇāṃ dhāraṇā*; *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 37v3 (51.2): *nivasanaṃ pañcamudrādi gātrasya*; *Abhidhānottara* B f. 10v2–2 (3.18): *pañcamudrādharo nityaṃ kapālakṛtaśekharaḥ | kapālakhaṭvāṅgadhārī ca bhasmoddhūlitavigrahaḥ*; Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on *Laghuśaṃvara* 51.21a: *pañcamudrādīti. kaṇṭhikācūḍakeyūrakuṇḍalabrahmasūtrāṇīti*; Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on *Laghuśaṃvara*: p. 128: *pañca mudrā rucakaśiromaṇikuṇḍalakaṇṭhikāyajñopavītāḥ pañca | sarvadā tair avirahito bhavet*; *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 6.12c–13d: *kaṇṭhikārucakakuṇḍalaśiromaṇivibhūṣitāḥ yajñopavītaṃ bhasmeti mudrāṣaṭkaṃ prakīrtitam*; *Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba* f. 13r4 (*Herukābhyudaya* 15.27): *nub mo ru ni dam tshig ste | dpa' bo rtag tu gcer bu yin | sgrub pos sngags dang phyag rgya dang | phyag rgya lnga dang yang dag ldan* 'Observing the vows (*samayī*), the Sādhaka Hero (*vīraḥ*) [should] always [be] naked at night (*rātrau ca satataṃ nagnaḥ* [?]), equipped with the Mantras and Mudrās (*mantramudrānvitaḥ*), and wearing the five [bone] Mudrās (*pañcamudrāsamanvitaḥ*)'; *Hevajra* 1.3.14: *cakrī kuṇḍala kaṇṭhī ca haste rūcaka mekhalā | pañcabuddhaviśuddhyā ca etā mudrāḥ prakīrtitāḥ*; 1.6.2a: *śirasi cakrī dhartavyā* (= *śiromaṇiḥ*, a circlet of bone; the *mekhalā* is a filigree made of small pieces of bone worn around the hips); *Hevajra* 1.6.16cd: *bhasma keśapavitraṃ ca yogī bibharti caryayā*; *Muktāvalī* ad loc.: *keśapavitraṃ keśayajñopavītam*; *Vajrāvalī* B, p. 218: *athavā nṛnaharumayaṃ keśakṛtaṃ vā brahmasūtram* 'or the sacred thread may be made of human sinew or hair'; *Abhisamayamañjarī*, pp. 131–132: *cakrīkuṇḍalakaṇṭhikārucakakhaṇḍāṅkamekhalākhyapañcamudrādharām* (see here p. 174) | *kaṇṭhikārucakakuṇḍalāni śiromaṇivibhūṣitam | yajñopavītaṃ bhasmeti mudrāṣaṭkaṃ prakīrtitam iti kecit*. For the Śaiva case see, e.g., *Svacchandoddyota* on 3.2b: *mudrālaṅkārabhūṣitaḥ śikhākarṇaprakoṣṭhapratiṣṭhāpitapañcamudraḥ*; *Picumata*, f. 101r3 (21.104): *karṇau śirasi bāhūbhyām asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitaḥ*; a verse cited by Yāmunācārya in his *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p. 93 (Y), edited here by collation with the closely related verse cited by Nirmalamaṇi as cited by Brunner in *Somaśambhupaddhati* vol. 3, p. 681, n. 7 (N): **kaṇṭhikā* (em. : *karṇikā*

The pan-Indian topography of the Śākta Śaivas' sacred sites, their Pīṭhas, Kṣetras, Upakṣetras, Saṃdohas/Chandohas,[436] and the like, is also adopted. Two lists of such sites are found: one in the *Vajraḍāka* and the other in the *Laghuśaṃvara*.[437] Also adopted is the practice of visiting these sacred sites (*pīṭhabhramaṇam*)[438] in search of meetings with the Yoginīs/Ḍākinīs that are

---

Y : *kuṇḍikā* N) *kuṇḍalaṃ caiva* **rucakaṃ* (Y : *uragaṃ* N) *ca* **śikhāmaṇiḥ* (*ṇiḥ* N : *ṇim* Y) | **bhasma yajñopavītaṃ ca* (Y : *keśayajñopavītaṃ* ca N) **mudrāṣaṭkaṃ pracakṣate* (Y : *mudrā ete mahāvratāḥ* [< *mahāvrate*]) 'The [Kāpālikas] teach that the six Mudrās are (1) the necklace, (2) the earrings, (3) the bracelets, (4) the hair-jewel, (5) ashes and (6) the sacred thread [made from human hair]'. This followed in Y by a second verse: *kapālam atha khaṭvāṅgam upamudre prakīrtite | ābhir mudritadehas tu na bhūya iha jāyate* 'The skull-bowl and skull-staff are called the sub-Mudrās. One whose body is sealed by these [eight] is not born again in this [world]'; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 201v3: *dvitīyaṃ tu vrataṃ vakṣye ghorakāpālarūpiṇa<m> | śire kapālamukuṭaṃ śiromālāvibhūṣitam | kare karṇau tathā pādau asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitau | vāme kapālaṃ khaṭvāṅgaṃ tathā vai dakṣiṇe kare*. The six Mudrās minus the ashes, that is to say, the five of the Buddhist lists, are defined, but not numbered, in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1, f. 139r1–3 (23.33–36b), in the order earrings, bracelets, hair-jewel, sacred thread of human hair, and necklace: *vīrāṇāṃ nṛpaśārdūla tantre 'smin bhairavārcite | śubhraśaṅkhe prakartavye dvyaṅgule karṇike śubhe |* **rucake* (em. : *caruke* Cod.) *dvyaṅgule śaste turyāṅguṣṭhaḥ śikhāmaṇiḥ | trivṛnnarakacotpannas tripañcasarikaḥ samaḥ | kaṇṭhāj jaghanasaṃsparśī* (**ja* corr. : *jaṅ* Cod.) *śastaḥ pañcavaṭo 'pi ca || suvṛttamaṇisaṃghā***ta*(corr. : *taḥ* Cod.)*saṃghātaikāvalī samā | dhāryā sādhakacandreṇa śeṣabhūtā tadiccha***yā* (em. : *gā* Cod). The 80th chapter of the *Picumata* describes, but does not number, (1) the hair-jewel, (2) earrings, (3) a necklace (*kaṇṭhamudrā*), (4) the sacred thread, and (5) ornaments of bone on hands, arms and hips. The last takes the place of the bracelets (*rucake*) listed elsewhere and in Vajrayānist texts (*Picumata* ff. 311v-312r): *cūḍāmaṇikapālena śikhāyāṃ yo niveśitaḥ | īśvaras tatra vijñeyo adhidevo varānane | jñānaśaktiḥ kriyākhyā ca karṇike parikīrtite | kaṇṭhe sthitā tu yā mudrā ahaṃ tatrādhidevatam | rudro mātṛgaṇaiḥ sārdhaṃ jñātavyas tu varānane | anantā hy upavīte tu śaktiḥ sarvādhvagā parā | hastabāhukaṭisthaiś ca viṣṇur jñeyo 'dhidevatam | śaktayo vividhākārā jaṭānām adhidevatam | etan mahārthadaṃ devi yo vijānāti tattvataḥ | śivavat sa tu boddhavyo viruddhācaraṇo 'pi yaḥ*.

[436] The Śaiva term *saṃdohaḥ* for one class of site consistently appears in Buddhist treatments in the form *chandohaḥ* (e.g. *Laghuśaṃvara* 50.22 and *Hevajra* 1.6.10). This substitution of initial *ch-* for *s-/ś-* is probably an east-Indianism; cf. Oriya *chañcibā* < Skt. *saṃcayati*; Bengali *chātu* < Skt. *saktuḥ*; Oriya *chāc*, *chacā* < Skt. *satya-*; Bengali *chut*, Bengali and Oriya *chutā* < Skt. *sūtram*; Oriya *chaṇa* < Skt. *śaṇaḥ*; Bengali *chādlā* < Skt. *śādvalam*; and Bengali *chikal*, *chikli* < Skt. *śṛṅkhala-*, *śṛṅkhalikā*.

[437] On these lists see here pp. 192–203.

[438] See, e.g. *Saṃvarodaya* 8.29b,d: *pīṭhādideśagamanena viśuddhadehaṃ ... vande sadā guruvaraṃ śirasā natena* 'At all times, with head bowed, I venerate the best of Gurus, ... whose body has been purified by going to the Pīṭhas and other [such] sites'; 9.25: *pīṭhopapīṭhasevanān nirmalo bhavati mānavaḥ | bhraman nimittaṃ saṃlakṣya nirvikalpena dhīmataḥ* 'A man becomes pure by frequenting Pīṭhas and Upapīṭhas. The adept should wander [there] without hesitation, observing [any] signs [that may arise] without inhibition'; 26.14 ... 18c–19:

believed to frequent them and to be incarnate there in human women enlightened from birth or in childhood;[439] classifying such women as belonging to one

---

pīṭhe kṣetre ca cchandohe melāpakaśmaśānake || pūjyapūjakasaṃbandhe amṛtam argham uttamam || ...pratiṣṭhāhomakāleṣu pīṭhabhramaṇagocare || naimitte yoginīpūjye mantrasādhanatatkṣaṇe | evaṃ bahuvidhā jñeyā tasya doṣo na vidyate 'In a Pīṭha, Kṣetra, Chandoha, Melāpaka, a cremation-ground, or an encounter between worshipper and worshipped, wine is the highest guest-water. ...on the occasion of installation ceremonies, when wandering through the Pīṭhas, during worship of the Yoginīs occasioned by some event, and when doing the Sādhana of a Mantra. He should know that there are a manifold [occasions] such as these [on which he may drink wine]. He will not be at fault'. Cf. *Niśisaṃcāra*, f. 10v2–3: *evam eva prakāreṇa ghorasādhanatatparam | kṣetra paryaṭamānasya sādhakasya mahādhiye | śabdaṃ dadāti yaḥ kaścit tasya praśnaṃ vadāmy aham* 'O you of great understanding, I shall teach [you] the requests [that should be addressed] to any [divine being] who speaks to the Sādhaka as he wanders in this manner visiting the Kṣetras, intent on the Ghorasādhana'; *Tantrāloka* 29.40ab: *iti saṃketābhijño bhramate pīṭheṣu yadi sa siddhīpsuḥ* 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pīṭha to Pīṭha knowing these signs[, the *chummāḥ*] ....

[439] Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on 26.1, p. 125: *yāvanti kṣetropakṣetrāṇi yogapīṭhāni tatra vyavasthitā dūtyaḥ siddhidāś cumbanāvagūhanād etāḥ viśeṣeṇeti yāvat* 'Dūtīs are present in all the Yogapīṭhas, the Kṣetras, and Upakṣetras. These bestow Siddhi, especially through kissing and copulating [with the Sādhaka]'; *Laghuśaṃvara* 41.4c–5, reconstucted from the lemmata in the *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Bhavabhaṭṭa, the commentary *Sādhananidhi* of Kambalapāda (K), this passage as incorporated in *Vajraḍāka* f. 41v2 (18.2) (V), and the Tibetan translation (T): *sarvottareṣu pīṭhādi ḍākinyas tu sarvavyāpinī | deśe deśe* **'bhijāyante* (V, *mngon par skye* T : *jāyante* K) *jñānayuktāḥ svayoniṣu | ḍākinyas tāḥ samākhyātāḥ vajramaṇḍalanāyikāḥ* 'In all these superior [sites] in various regions, namely the Pīṭhas and the rest, women are born who are endowed with knowledge in their mother's wombs. It is these that are called Ḍākinīs, leaders of the Vajramaṇḍala'. Cf. *Tantrasadbhāva* f. 115v3–4 (16.279c–280): *vijñāna-m-udayaṃm āsāṃ kathyamānaṃ nibodha me | pīṭhajāś cāṣṭabhir varṣaiḥ kṣetrajā dvādaśābdikāḥ | dvāre ṣoḍaśabhir devi yonijāḥ saptaviṃśati* 'Listen to my account of the emergence of the enlightenment of these [Yoginīs]. Those born in Pīṭhas [achieve it] at the age of eight, those born in Kṣetras at the age of twelve, [those born in] Dvāras at the age of sixteen, and those born of [lowly] wombs at the age of twenty-seven'. Cf. *Tantrāloka* 15.97cd–100b: *bāhye tu tādṛśāntaḥsthayogamārgaviśāradāḥ || devyaḥ svabhāvāj jāyante pīṭhaṃ tad bāhyam ucyate | yathā svabhāvato mlecchā adharmapathavartinaḥ || tatra deśe niyatyetthaṃ jñānayogau sthitau kvacit | yathā cātanmayo 'py eti pāpitāṃ taiḥ samāgamāt || tathā pīṭhasthito 'py eti jñānayogādipātratām* 'In the outer [Pīṭhas, Kṣetras and the rest as opposed to these transposed into the person of the worshipper] divine women are born who are innately adept in the path of such internal meditation. Just as the barbarians of other lands naturally follow paths outside of ordained religion, so in some [women] in these places enlightenment and meditation-trance are naturally present. And just as a person becomes a sinner through association with those [barbarians], even though he makes no effort to assimilate, so a person residing in a Pīṭha becomes the beneficiary of enlightenment, meditation-trance, and [Siddhis]'; and 29.40: *iti saṃketābhijño bhramate pīṭheṣu yadi sa siddhīpsuḥ | acirāl labhate tat tat prāpyaṃ yad yoginīvadanāt* 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pīṭha to Pīṭha knowing these signs[, the *chummāḥ*], he quickly attains from the mouths

or other a fixed number of deity-clans (*kulam*) and of specifying various characteristics of appearance and behaviour that enable the adept to determine these clan-affiliations;[440] the consumption and offering of meat and alcoholic liquor in their rites;[441] the consumption of foul substances without inhibition as an initiatory test of nondual awareness;[442] the sacrifice and consumption of the flesh

---

of Yoginīs whatever he wishes'.

[440] *Laghuśaṃvara*, Paṭalas 16–24 (> *Abhidhānottara*, *Saṃpuṭodbhava*, *Saṃvarodaya*, *Mahāmudrātilaka*, *Vajraḍāka*); and parallel passages in the Vidyāpīṭha texts *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, *Tantrasadbhāva*, *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, and *Picumata*. For full references see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 42–43 (Table I).

[441] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 497: *āsu pūjanīyā madyaiś ca māṃsair api vajradevyaḥ | tāḥ pūjitā bhaktimato janasya śrīherukasyābhiratiṃ gatasya saṃtuṣṭacittā varadā bhavanti* 'On these [lunar days] [the women who embody] the Vajra goddesses should be worshipped with offerings of alcohol and flesh. When they have been worshipped they become delighted and bestow boons on any devotee who is attached to Heruka'; *Abhidhānottara* B f. 48v5– (6.50d–56a): *vividhai<ḥ> samayottamaiḥ* || **madyair* (em. : *padma* Cod.) *nānāvidhai<ś> caiva surāpānais tathottamaiḥ* | **vīramelāpakaṃ* (*vīra* corr. : *vīrā* Cod.) *divyaṃ yoginī vividhottamā<ḥ>* || *kapālakhaṭvāṅgakarā<ḥ> kartikāḍamarukottamā<ḥ>* | *vādyai<r> nānāvidhair divyai<r> bhojyabhakṣyarasottamaiḥ* || *vividhaiś cumbanāliṅgaiś coṣyalehyottamottamaiḥ* | *evaṃvidhaṃ śmaśānaṃ tu yakṣavetāḍarākṣasaiḥ* || *baliṃ tatraiva dātavyaṃ *herukarūpam* (em. : *heruko rūpam* Cod.) *udvahet* | *ḍamaruvajraghaṇṭā<ṃ> ca vādyanṛtya<ṃ> prakurvati* || *digvāsā mudrayā yukto hūṃphaṭkilakilāyate* | *ālīḍhapadayogena jvālāmudrāṃ tu bhāvayet* || *mukham āpūrya samayaiḥ* 'The illustrious assembly of Vīras [with Yoginīs should be celebrated] with [the eating of] the various superior sacramental meats [detailed above], with various wines and excellent draughts of rice-beer. The various Yoginīs, holding the skull-bowl, skull-staff, a chopping-knife, and a rattle-drum [should be gratified] with various forms of music, the savours of excellent foods soft and hard, with kisses and embraces, with foods to be sucked and licked. Such [should be] the cremation ground [on this occasion]. There he should offer Bali to the Yakṣas, Vetālas, and Rākṣasas. He should assume the form of Heruka. He should [sound] the rattle-drum and Vajra-bell, dance, and make music and dance. Naked together with his consort (*mudrā*) he utters the syllables HUṂ PHAṬ and cries of joy. Standing in the warrior pose he should make the Flame Mudrā with his hands, having filled his mouth with the sacramental meats'. Paṭala 16 of the *Saṃvarodaya* is devoted to the preparation and use of alcoholic drinks. At its end (16.51abc) it says: *madyapānaṃ vinā pūjā homaś caiva ghṛtaṃ vinā | sadguruṃ ca vinā dharmaṃ* 'There cannot be worship without drinking wine, fire-sacrifice without clarified butter, or religious practice without the Guru'. Cf. the scriptural passages on the indispensability of wine in Kaula worship cited by Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 29.1–13. One of those passages says that beer is the Goddess and wine Bhairava; *surā ca paramā śaktir madyaṃ bhairava ucyate* (p. 9, line 2). Cf. *Saṃvarodaya* 16.12cd: *yā surā *vajrayoginyā* (conj. : *vajrayoginyo* Ed.) *yo madaḥ sa ca herukaḥ* 'Beer is Vajrayoginī and wine is Heruka.'

[442] See, e.g., Kumāracandra, *Herukābhyudayapañjikā*, p. 156: *tatreti maṇḍale 'mbhojabhājane saṃskṛta<ṃ> biḍālaviḍādikaṃ dakṣiṇābhimukhācāryo vāsobaddhāsyaṃ śiṣyam ānīya oṃkārādigāyatryā rakṣitvā *potaṅgīpratipotaṅgīpraśnottarakriyāpūrvakaṃ* (corr. : *potaṅgīṃ pratipotaṅgīṃ* Ed.) *praveśya tadāsye niveśayet* 'There, that is to say, before the Maṇḍala, the Ācārya, facing south,

of human beings believed to have been reincarnated seven times for this purpose (*saptāvartaḥ*), recognized in both traditions on the basis of similar physical characteristics, and the use of their skulls as skull-bowls;[443] the practice of visualizations in which the Sādhaka enters the body of a victim through the channels of his vital energy (*nāḍī*), extracts his vital essences, and draws them into himself;[444] that of yogically raising one's consciousness out of one's body through

---

should sacramentalize in a skull-bowl some substance such as cat excrement. He should then lead the blindfolded candidate forward, protect him with the Gāyatrī [of Heruka] beginning with OṂ, and after addressing him with the word POTAṄGĪ[, the *chommā* of welcome] and having received [the *chommā*] PRATIPOTAṄGĪ in response, he should bring him before [the Maṇḍala] and place that substance in his mouth'. For the Śaiva literature see the passages cited in SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 113–114, fn. 63.

[443] See, e.g, *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 10r3–4 (11.1–2) and 49.4–13 (49.4–8 = f. 35v5–7; 49.8–13 = *bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 244r2–5); *Abhidhanottara*, Paṭala 63; *Herukābhyudaya*, Paṭala 13 (*Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba* f. 10r7–v6); *Hevajratantra* 1.11.10–11; *Mahāmudrātilaka* f. 23r3–4 (12.20–21): *tādṛśaṃ yatnāt saptajanmānam ānayet | nānāpūjopahāreṇa pūjayet taṃ samāhitaḥ || tasyottamāṅgam utkṛtya kārayet padmabhājanam | tatraiva pātre madanaṃ pāyayet prajñayā saha* 'He should with all effort bring such a man of seven rebirths. With concentrated mind he should honour him with the various offering-substances. Having decapitated him he should make the head into a skull-bowl. In that vessel he should drink wine with his consort'; f. 51r5–v2 (24.1–3c): *athānyaṃ *caiva* (conj. : *caika* Cod.) *karmākhyaṃ pravakṣyāmy ādarāc chṛṇu | yena prāśitamātreṇa āśu siddhiḥ pravartate || susnigdhaś ca sugandhāṅgaḥ sugandhasvedamaṇḍitaḥ | satyavādī salajjātmā niveśati ciraṃ sadā | kṛpāparaḥ kṣāntiyutaḥ satyavādī nirāśrayaḥ | saptajanmā trijanmā vā*. In the Vidyāpīṭha literature see the treatments of this topic in *Jayadrathayāmala Ṣaṭka* 3, *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, *Kālajñānapaṭala*; *Tantrasadbhāva*, *Adhikāra* 7; and *Tantrāloka* 16.63–64 and Jayaratha's introduction to this passage.

[444] See, e.g., *Herukābhyudayapañjikā* on *Herukābhyudaya*, Paṭala 13 p. 155: *svadehāt ḍākinīḥ sphārayitvā sādhye gudena praveśya navadvārair nāḍīmārgeṇa paśoḥ sādhyasya *bījaṃ* (conj. : *bījaṃ jīvaṃ bījuṃ* Ed.) *śukrādikaṃ grāhayitvā niṣkāśya svadehe praveśayet* 'He should emanate the Ḍākinīs from inside his body, have them enter the victim through his anus [or any one of] the nine apertures and passing through the channels of the victim's vital energies, seize his seed, his semen and other [vital essences]. Then he should have them exit [the victim] and return [with these] into [his own body]'; on *Herukābhyudaya*, Paṭala 42, p. 167: *athavā sādhyam ākṛṣya tacchukrādi pītvā bhakṣayet* 'Having attracted the victim he should [extract and] drink his semen and other [essences], then eat [the flesh]'; *Abhidhānottara* B f. 51v1–3 (9.62–64b): *vārāhyātmabhāvena tarjanyā nābhi vedhayet | ḍākinyādi tu cakrasthā devya<ḥ> *śūcyākṛtīs* (em. : *sūcyākṛtās* Cod.) *tathā || navadvāre *praveśyaitā* (conj. : *praveśya tāṃ* Cod.) **vedhayed* (corr. : *vidhayed* Cod.) *dhṛdayapaṅkajam | yoginyā hata*mātre* (conj. : *mātraṃ* Cod.) *tu pibet kṣatajam uttamam || hataṃ ca bhakṣayet so hi buddho bhaviṣyati nānyathā* 'By identifying with Vārāhī he should pierce the navel [of the victim] with his index finger [in the gesture of threat] and cause the Ḍākinīs and other goddesses of the Maṇḍala to take on the form of a needle [through visualization]. When he has made them enter [the victim in this form] through the nine apertures [of the body] he should have them pierce through the lotus of his heart. As soon as the Yoginīs have killed him he should drink his excellent blood and eat his flesh. For it is certain

the central channel as a means of ending one's life and ascending to a paradise or liberation, a practice known as *utkrāntiḥ* in Śaiva sources and thence in the Buddhist Yoginītantras (Tib. *'pho ba*);[445] the adaptation of this practice as a

---

that [thus] he will become a Buddha'; *Mahāmāyā* 2.10–14b. On the extraction of the vital essences by such yogic means in Vidyāpīṭha sources see, e.g., *Picumata* f. 10v1–4 (3.198c–207): *praviśya ca puraṃ divyaṃ *japtvā* (em. : *japtā* Cod.) *cāṣṭaśataṃ punaḥ* || 199 *avadhūtatanur bhūtvā prayogam idam ārabhet* | *paśubījasamāyuktaṃ Ū-kāreṇaiva bheditam* || 200 *karṣaye tu samādhistho raktaughaṃ raktayā saha* | *tena raktena mantrajñaḥ paripūrṇakapālake* || 3.201 *sugandhakusumair yukte tenārghaṃ tu pradāpayet* | *devīnāṃ devadevāya sarvasiddhyarthakāraṇam* || 3.202 *datte 'rghe tu prasiddhyeta trailokyaṃ nātra saṃśayaḥ* | *athavā caiva Ū-kāraṃ paśubījasamanvitam* || 3.203 *codayitvā udānena avadhūtatanuḥ *sadā* (corr. : *sadāḥ* Cod.) | *nirācāreṇa bhāvena paśudehaṃ viśet tataḥ* || 3.204 *tatrastho grahaṇaṃ kuryāt bhūtānāṃ mantracintakaḥ* | *apānena tataḥ śīghraṃ svadehaṃ praviśed budhaḥ* || 3.205 *pañcabhūtāni cākṛṣya pūjayīta kapāladhṛk* | *raktena prathamā<ṃ> devī<ṃ> dvitīyā<ṃ> māṃsabhakṣaṇe* || 3.206 *tṛtīyā tvak-ca-bhakṣā tu caturthī medabhakṣaṇā* | *snehena tarpayed devaṃ pañcavyomāntasaṃsthitam* || 3.207 *etat te paramaṃ guhyaṃ yogeśīnāṃ tu pūjanam* | *siddhyarthaṃ caiva mantrīṇāṃ khecaratvajigīṣuṇām* 'After entering before the celestial Maṇḍala he should repeat the Mantra eight hundred times. When [in this way] he has become one whose body has transcended all duality he should commence the following procedure. In deep meditation he should draw out a stream of the [victim's] blood with the [Mantra of] Raktā conjoined with the Victim-seed with Ū as the [final] vowel. The Mantra adept should place fragrant flowers in a skull, fill it with that blood, and present it as the guest-offering to the goddesses and Bhairava as the means of accomplishing all Siddhis. Alternatively he should propel the letter Ū combined with the Victim-seed up [along the central channel] with the ascending vital energy and in the state that transcends convention he should enter the victim's body. Once within it the adept should take hold of the gross elements [of the victim's body] while meditating on the Mantra and then swiftly return into his own body by drawing in his breath. When he has drawn them into himself the Kāpālika (*kapāladhṛk*) should worship [his deities with them]. He worships the first goddess by offering her the blood, and the second by offering her the flesh to eat. The third eats the skin and the fourth the fat. With the fluid of the body he should gratify the god [Kapālīśabhairava] who resides beyond the five voids [along the central channel]. This worship is the highest secret of the Yogeśvarīs. [I have taught it] to you so that Mantra adepts that seek to master the state of the Khecara may succeed'. See also *Tantrasadbhāva*, ff. 181v5–182r2 (27.1–10); *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 184r6 (*Yoginīsaṃcāra* 5.40): *yasmātra karmaṇo siddhī raktākarṣaṇapūrvikā* | *tarpaṇaṃ devatānāṃ ca* 'For in this [system] the success of the ritual and the gratification of the deities requires the extraction of [the victim's] blood'; *Tantrāloka* 16.35c–51b, describing the yogic process in detail; and *Netratantra* 20, which describes how Yoginīs extract life-essences from their victims in this way in order to offer them up to Mahābhairava and thereby liberate them.

[445] *Catuṣpīṭha* ff. 68v–70r (*Guhyapīṭha*, Paṭala 3) and Bhavabhaṭṭa thereon (*Catuṣpīṭhanibandha* ff. 50v4–52v7); *Vajraḍāka* ff. 50r7–52r3 (Paṭala 21); *Saṃpuṭodbhava* ff. 78r5–80r6 (Kalpa 8, Prakaraṇa 3); *Saṃvarodaya* 5.67–69 and 19.35c–47. In Tibetan tradition this practice is one of the *nā ro chos drug* or Six Teachings of Nāropā (956–1040), commonly known in English as his Six Yogas. These have been the object of extensive Tibetan exegesis. For English translations of some of these works, including the *Chos drug gi man ngag* attributed to

means of assisting the dying and the dead—we have seen a ritualized realization of this in the Mantranaya's funeral ceremony taught by Padmaśrīmitra and Śūnyasamādhi[446]—; and the practice of transferring one's consciousness out of one's body to pass into and animate a corpse (*parakāyapraveśaḥ*).[447]

Nor is the adoption of the Vidyāpīṭha's practices restricted to externals. It also extended into the domain of Yoga. For one of the most striking features that distinguish the Yoginītantras from the Yogatantras and indeed from all that preceded them in the history of Buddhism is that they based their inner practice on the theory that the body is pervaded and sustained by a network of energy channels (*nāḍī*), variously numbered, with three pre-eminent: two vertical lateral channels, *lalanā* and *rasanā*, and a hidden third extending between up the centre of the body to the head, called *avadhūtī* or *caṇḍālī*, with Cakras located along its course, which was to be awakened and perceived as the means of access to the bliss (*sahajānandaḥ*, *mahāsukham*) of enlightened awareness. This Yoga of meditation on the channels of the vital energy and the Cakras is not found in the transitional *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*[448] nor indeed in the *Laghuśaṃvara*,

---

Tilopā, the *sNyan rgyud rdo rje'i tshig rkang* attributed to Nāropā, and the *Nā ro chos drug gi 'khrid rim yid ches gsum ldan* of Tsong kha pa (1357–1419) (*Gsung 'bum*, vol. *ta*, pp. 401–532) see MULLIN 1996 and 1997. For Tsong kha pa's detailed treatment of this practice of ascent from the body see MULLIN 1996, pp. 209–215. His sources are those Tantras listed here: the *Catuṣpīṭha* (and Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary), the *Vajraḍāka*, the *Saṃpuṭa* (= *Saṃpuṭodbhava*), and the *Saṃvarodaya*. MULLIN translates the Tibetan rendering of these titles into English. He identifies his 'Mystic Kiss Tantra' as the *Caturyoginīsaṃpuṭa*. It is in fact the *Saṃpuṭa*, the work that also appears in this translation as the *Sambhuta Tantra*, reproducing a faulty Tibetan transcription of the same title. Tsong kha pa notes that this practice of ascent from one's body (*utkrāntiḥ*) is a unique feature of the highest (*bla na med*) Buddhist Tantra class (MULLIN 1996, p. 209). That is so within the Buddhist Tantras; but the source of the practice is the Śaiva tradition, whose texts have always placed a great emphasis on it both in the Atimārga and in the Mantramārga; see *Pāśupatasūtra* 5.30–40; *Pampāmāhātmya* 11.54–71 (explaining that passage); *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, *Adhyāya* 182; *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, Paṭala 9; *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* 11.13–19b; *Dviśatika-Kālottara* ff. 2v9–3r6; *Trayodaśaśatika-Kālottara* ff. 30r9–31r7; *Kiraṇa*, Paṭala 59; *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Caryāpāda*, Paṭala 9; *Picumata*, *Paṭala* 100; *Mālinīvijayottara* 17.25–33; *Tantrasadbhāva* f. 36r11–v10 (9.294–321); *Tantrāloka* 28.292–302; and, in Java/Bali, *Jñānasiddhānta*, chapters 3, 5–7, and 20.

[446] See here pp.126–128. For the Śaiva adaptation of this practice as a means of liberating the dying see, e.g., *Tantrāloka* 19.1–56 (*sadya-utkrāntidīkṣā utkrāmaṇī dīkṣā*).

[447] *Vajraḍāka* f. 51r1–3 (21.19–22). In the Śaiva literature see *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* f. 22v4 (*Niśvāsamula* 7.20), (>) *Svacchanda* 7.328c–329b; *Picumata* f. 11v (3.228–232b); (5.95–101); f. 356r4–v3 (96.19–35); *Tantrasadbhāva* ff. 181v5–182r3 (27.1–11); *Mālinīvijayottara* 21.9–19; and *Tantrāloka* 28.294–300. This practice too is one of the 'Six Yogas of Nāropā' (*nā ro chos drug*); see Tsong kha pa, *op. cit.* translated in MULLIN 1996, pp. 215–216.

[448] See also TANAKA 1996, p. 272.

but it is much developed in the latter's ancillary scriptures such as the *Vajraḍāka* and *Saṃvarodaya*, and elsewhere in the Yoginītantras, notably in the *Hevajra*, the *Saṃpuṭodbhava*, the *Mahāmudrātilaka*, and the *Kālacakra*.[449]

The elements of this model are 'purifed through equation' (*viśuddha-*) with Buddhist soteriological factors, either newly acquired, such as the twenty-four sacred sites or long established in the Mahāyāna, such as the three bodies of a Buddha (*nirmāṇakāyaḥ*, *saṃbhogakāyaḥ*, and *dharmakāyaḥ*), equated with the three principal channels, and Means (*upāyaḥ*) and Wisdom (*prajñā*), whose co-functioning (*yuganaddhavāhitā*) is the way to liberation, equated with the lateral pair.[450] But the basic conception is derived from the Yoga of the Śaivas in general and the Śākta Śaivas in particular.

THE INCORPORATION OF TEXT-PASSAGES FROM THE VIDYĀPĪṬHA. In the light of this evidence of the pervasive similarities between the Yoginītantras and the Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha, and considering the fact that these similarities set the Yoginītantras apart from all earlier forms of Buddhism, the reader will not be surprised to know that there is also evidence that this tradition incorporated

---

[449] That the Yoga of the energy channels was one of the principal features that distinguished the Yoginītantras was asserted by the learned of the Mantranaya itself; see Śraddhākaravarman cited here on p.239; also Mkhas grub rje, *rGyud spyi*, p. 256, ll. 6–7: *phung khams skye mched kyi rnam dag gtso bor ston pa's rgyud yin na pha rgyud | rtsa'i rnam dag gtso bor ston pa ma rgyud* 'If a Tantra principally teaches the purification of the Skandhas, Dhātus, and Āyatanas it is a Father Tantra. A Mother Tantra principally teaches the purification of the energy channels'. In this passage the distinction is between the esoteric Yogatantras (Mahāyogatantras, Yogottaratantras) headed by the *Guhyasamāja* and the Yoginītantras or Yoganiruttaratantras exemplified by the Tantras of Śaṃvara and Hevajra, the two divisions of what the Tibetans called *bla med kyi rgyud* 'the unsurpassed Tantra [class]'. Mkhas grub rje's tradition rejects this criterion for distinguishing between the two divisions on the grounds that there are Yoginītantras (Mother Tantras) that also teach the purification of the Skandhas and the rest. That is true. We find this, for example, in the *Hevajra* (1.7.12; 1.9.6–9, 13–14; 2.2.31–36) and the *Abhidhānottara* (e.g. B ff. 20v5–21r1; f. 26r3; f. 36r3–v6; f. 51r3–4; ff. 69v2–70r1). But that is because the second-wave Yoginītantras sought to encompass the tradition of the *Guhyasamāja* by incorporating many of its elements. He does not, we may note, support his argument by pointing to the presence of the purification of the energy channels in any Father Tantra. From the historian's point of view the distinction that he rejects remains accurate in spite of his objections. VAN SCHAIK (2008, p. 50) has noted the absence of material on the manipulation of the internal energies in the Dunhuang manuscripts, which represent Tantric Buddhism up to about the middle of the ninth century.

[450] For a comprehensive listing of 'purifying equations' for the principal channels and four Cakras (the Nirmāṇacakra at the root of the navel, the Dharmacakra in the heart, the Saṃbhogacakra in the throat, and the Mahāsukhacakra in the head) see *Jñānodayatantra*, p. 6, ll. 1–14 (the four Cakras), and p. 6, l. 20–p. 7, l. 9 (the three channels).

and adapted much textual material from the Śaiva scriptures in the process of producing its own.

This is particularly evident in the case of the *Laghuśaṃvara* and its satellites. I have reported and tabulated elsewhere correspondences with passages in five Śaiva scriptures: (1) the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* of the third *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*,[451] (2) the short redaction of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*—a much longer redaction, known to Abhinavagupta, has not come down to us—, (3) the *Tantrasadbhāva*, (4) the *Picumata* (/*Brahmayāmala*), and (5) the *Niśisaṃcāra*, all of which are texts of the Vidyāpīṭha. There are also a few correspondences with earlier texts of the Buddhist Mantranaya;[452] but unlike those the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s parallels with the Vidyāpīṭha are not short passages of one or two verses but detailed and continuous expositions that run in two cases over several chapters, amounting in all to some 200 verses out of a total of about 700 with some prose equivalent in length to about 80 more. They teach the characteristics by which the initiate may recognize women as belonging to various classes of Yoginī, Ḍākinī, and Lāmā, and vocabularies of special words and gestures (*chommāḥ*) for communicating with them when encountered (Paṭalas 15–24), the rules (*samayāḥ*) that bind initiates as they engage in post-initiatory *caryā* (Paṭalas 26–29), the system of Pīṭhas and other sacred pilgrimage centres for wandering ascetics engaged in this practice (Paṭala 41), and the characteristics of the ideal sacrificial victim known as a *saptāvartaḥ* or *saptajanmā* (Paṭala 49).[453]

---

[451] The *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, though it comes to us as part of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, has very probably been incorporated from another source. This is evident from the register of its Sanskrit, from its style, and from its content. This source may be a text closely related to the lost *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*. For it claims at its beginning to be about to explain what has already been taught in that Tantra. *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 169r8 (*Yoginīsaṃcāra* 1.1–6b): *devy uvāca || purā tu śaṃvare tantre yad uktaṃ parameśvara | *tan na* (em. : *tatra* Cod.) *jñātaṃ mayā deva guhyatantrasya vistarāt || 2 kathaṃ sa bhairavo dehas tvayi deva mahābalaḥ | kathaṃ devyo yajanty enaṃ kulās tāsāṃ kati smṛtāḥ || 3 kathaṃ kramaṃ mahāgūḍha<ṃ> cāraṃ tāsāṃ kathaṃ vibho | carusiddhiḥ kathaṃ tāsām etan me brūhi vistaram || 4 evam ākarṇya deveśyāvadanāmburuhacyutam | vacomṛtaṃ mahādevo bhūyo vacanam abravīt || 5 sādhu sādhu mahābhage sarvajñānārthabhājane | mahārahasyam atulaṃ yoginīcāram uttamam || 6 pravakṣyāmi samāsena śṛṇuṣv' ekāgramānasā* 'The goddess said: Parameśvara, I have not understood the teaching that you gave of old in the *Śaṃvaratantra*, because of the great length of [that] esoteric text. What is the nature, O god, of your mighty embodiment as Bhairava? How do the goddesses worship it? How many are their families held to be? How is the most secret procedure of their worship? How, O lord, do they rotate? And how is one to obtain the sacramental substances for them? Explain this to me at length. Having heard thus the nectar in the form of words that fell from the lotus of the mouth of the goddess Mahādeva replied and said: I congratulate you, illustrious and worthy receptacle of the teachings of omniscience. I shall concisely teach you the incomparable great secret, the unsurpassed Rotation of the Yoginīs. Listen with attentive mind'. The last part of the first chapter of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* gives an account of the many classes of female supernaturals as the constituents of the body mentioned in the list of questions and ends with the words: *ity evaṃ yoganiyamaṃ yoginījāla*śaṃvare* (corr. : *saṃcare* D) | *yathotpannaṃ tu kathitaṃ *niyogaṃ* (em. : *niryogaṃ* D) *śṛṇu sāmpratam* (D f. 172v4–5, 1.72c–f) 'Thus I have explained to you the arising of the order of the pantheon of powers as [taught] in the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*. Hear now its application(s)'. See also D f. 199v6–7 (7.124c–125b): *uktāni yāni karmāṇi yoginījālaśaṃvare || ayutaṃ japtvā tu sarvāṇi karoty eva hi līlayā* 'After repeating the Mantra ten thousand times he easily accomplishes all the rites that I have taught in the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*'.

[452] See here p. 163.

These parallels demonstrate a high degree of overlap with the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha in the parts of the text and its satellites that deal with the religious discipline (*samayācāraḥ*) of the adherents of this form of Buddhism. Still lacking, however, was evidence of textual dependence in those parts that deal with that discipline's ritual core. But that gap can now be closed. For since publishing those results I have located further evidence in what survives of the Vidyāpīṭha's scriptures that this corpus was also the source of substantial parts of the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s instruction in this domain. The areas of prescription in which this textual dependence has emerged are (1) the daily worship of the 'Kulikā' prescribed in the first chapter of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, (2) the ceremony of initiation before the Maṇḍala through which a candidate becomes qualified and obliged to practice the Tantra's rites and observance, which is taught from the end of the first chapter to the beginning of the fourth; and (3) the ritual procedures for supernatural effects, mostly hostile sorcery, that form a considerable part of the work and take the form of fire-sacrifices (*homaḥ*), and the use of the Mantras and the name of the target (*sādhyanāma*) to empower substances in various ways and combinations to bring about these results. These new parallels are as follows:

1. The worship of the Kulikā: *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.4–7b (< *Herukābhyudaya* 15.6–10) < *Picumata* 84.9c–16.
2. The initiation ceremony: *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.15–4.1 < 8.3–28 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*.
3. The ritual procedures for supernatural effects:
   (a) *Laghuśaṃvara*, *Paṭala* 34 < *Picumata* 41.1–3, 49.3c–4c, 41.4–7b, 41.12abc, and 41.15d.
   (b) *Laghuśaṃvara*, *Paṭala* 35 < *Picumata* 26.1–2b, 26.41c–44.

---

[453] For my tabulation of these correspondences see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 41–47. See also SANDERSON 1985, p. 214, note 106; SANDERSON 1988, pp. 678–679; and SANDERSON 1994, esp. pp. 92–96.

   (c) *Laghuśaṃvara*, *Paṭala* 36 < *Picumata* 26.45c–48b.
   (d) *Laghuśaṃvara*, *Paṭala* 37 < *Picumata* 29.1ab, 30.1, 29.35, 29.38–48b, 29.50 [cf. 20.56–57], 29.61ab.
   (e) *Laghuśaṃvara*, *Paṭala* 50, up to v. 19 (the point at which the earlier redaction of the text ends) < *Picumata* 5.17–18, 5.23c–28, 5.63, 5.67, 5.70.

Comparison of the textual parallels reveals that it is the Cakrasaṃvara corpus that has adopted and adapted the Śaiva sources rather than the other way round. For the Buddhist versions abound in instances in which it can be seen that Śaiva material has been misunderstood, crudely, artificially, and incompletely modified, or rendered contextually incongruous. The Śaiva versions, on the other hand, seem to me to be entirely free of signs of textual dependence on Buddhist originals.

Before proceeding to demonstrate this through the presentation and analysis of examples I wish first to address an objection that has been raised against my conclusion.[454] I do so before my analysis because that objection, if it were valid, would block in advance the force of all my evidence, being based not on contrary analyses of particular parallels but on a perceived characteristic of all the materials I have identified. This characteristic is that the Buddhist versions are less clear in meaning, less grammatically correct. By concluding that the direction of redaction is from Śaiva materials to the Buddhist in spite of this characteristic I am held to have overlooked or violated the textual critic's maxim *lectio difficilior potior* 'The more difficult reading is to be preferred'. This maxim means that when one is confronted by two readings, both of which are plausible, one should prefer that which is less easily explained as the result of the alteration, accidental or deliberate, of the other, provided there is a clearly established line of transmission between the sources of the divergent readings. Thus, it is implied, the less clear and more incorrect Buddhist versions should be judged to have preceded the clearer and more correct Śaiva versions on the grounds that it is conceivable that a Śaiva redactor revised a deficient Buddhist version but not that a Buddhist spoiled a superior Śaiva version.[455]

What exactly the concept of lack of clarity is thought to cover in this argument is unclear; but I assume that the authors had in mind not merely grammatical deviations from the Paninian standard of high scholarship, since those are seldom difficult to understand, being characteristic of a particular register of the language, but also and principally lack of clarity in meaning caused by syntactical incoherence and the like, which is indeed a conspicuous defect in the Buddhist versions. Indeed they are sometimes barely intelligible, as is revealed by fact that the commentators confronted by these passages offer widely divergent but equally arbitary interpretations.[456]

---

[454] DAVIDSON 2002, p. 386, n. 105; and GRAY 2005, p. 8, n. 19.

[455] In fact it is not clear whether these authors think that the application of this principle means that the Buddhist versions *cannot* be secondary or only that it less likely that they are. The second alternative alone would accord with a more fundamental principle of textual criticism, namely that there are no hard-and-fast rules because every textual problem must be regarded as possibly unique (HOUSMAN 1921, pp. 68–69).

Now, the objection that a version which is less clear in this sense must have preceded one that is freer of these defects, proceeds from a serious misunderstanding of how the rule of the *lectio difficilior* is to be applied. Firstly, like all other 'rules' of textual criticism, it should never be put to work mechanically and in advance, without the application of thought to the weighing of probabilities in each case; and secondly, it should never be invoked to give precedence to readings that are grammatically defective, incoherent, or contextually awkward.[457] Lack of clarity is hardly likely to the fault of the original framers of the text-passages, who, after all, probably knew what they wanted to say in whatever register of Sanskrit they chose to adopt. It is much more likely to be the result of incompetence and/or carelessness on the part of Buddhist redactors who had difficulty in understanding the Śaiva texts they were cannibalizing.

The secondary status of the Buddhist versions is also apparent in another deficiency: their greater metrical irregularity. In principle that might be explained either as the result of the Śaivas' having polished the Buddhist versions or as the result of indifference to the preservation of metrical form on the part of Buddhist redactors as they adapted metrically correct Śaiva materials. But the latter explanation is much to be preferred. For, as we shall see, metrical irregularity is particularly noticeable in the Buddhist versions at those places where the imprint of Buddhism is apparent.[458]

Let us assume, however, that there are indeed readings in the Buddhist versions which do not derive from the Śaiva parallels that I have identified. Would these not refute my conclusion that the Buddhist versions are secondary? No. For

---

[456] See here p. 216.

[457] This point has been made against DAVIDSON and GRAY by SZÁNTÓ (2008b, p. 218). On the principle invoked here, that a 'more difficult reading' must be plausible, see WEST 1973, p. 51: "When we choose the 'more difficult reading' ... we must be sure that it is in itself a plausible reading. The principle should not be used in support of dubious syntax, or phrasing that it would not have been natural for the author to use. There is an important difference between a more difficult reading and a more unlikely reading"; CHADWICK 1957, p. 255: "The principle *lectio difficilior potior* does not extend to nonsense, ...".

[458] See here p. 207.

the inference that they would rests on the assumption that I consider that the Śaiva text-passages redacted into the Buddhist versions were *exactly* those seen in these parallels. In fact I hold that the collation of these parallels with the Buddhist passages demonstrates that the former are, in most cases at least, closely related variants of the passages on which the Buddhist redactors drew, and that these passages were accessed in what were probably earlier and less elaborate redactions of the works in which I have found the parallels, or else in texts of the same corpus which are now out of reach, such as the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*, the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga*, the long version of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, and the *Pañcāmṛta*.[459] For what survives in the manuscript collections of India and Nepal is only a part of what once existed, as we learn both from citations of other texts in the works of learned Śaiva commentators and from the surviving scriptural redactions themselves, which, when listing the canon of texts to which they belong, mention many works, such as those mentioned above, which have not survived or await discovery.[460] My argument, then, is not that these Śaiva parallels are the direct sources of the Buddhist versions but only that the Śaiva parallels are close enough to the Buddhist versions to reveal the direction of dependence. It is possible, therefore, that any 'more difficult readings' were inherited from this earlier stratum in the development of the Vidyāpīṭha; and this mere possibility is sufficient to invalidate the inference of the priority of the Buddhist versions. If I am mistaken in my conclusion that the Buddhist versions are secondary that will have to be demonstrated by presenting a persuasive contrary analysis of the relationship between the Śaiva and Buddhist versions based on a detailed examination of the particulars I have identified. General arguments of this kind, which attempt to settle the matter in advance without engaging with the specifics of the parallels, will not suffice.[461]

---

[459] On these sources see SANDERSON 2007, pp. 234–237, footnotes 15–16, and 21–22.

[460] See, for example, the list of Tantras 'venerated by the circle of Yoginīs' given in the first chapter of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* as sources on the matters it covers (*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, ff. D 170v2–171r3 [1.29–42b]): *mūlatantraṃ* ***kubjikā*** *ca yoginījālaśamvaram* | **aṭṭaśambaranāmānaṃ* (ABCE : *aṭṭaśasvaranāgānaṃ* D) *haṭṭadhūlis tathāparā* ‖ 1.30 *calākṣaraṃ mahātantraṃ viśvakrīḍāvatārakam* | *mahāmāyottaraṃ nāma sarvavīramataṃ tathā* | 1.31 *alaṅgrāsaṃ mahātantraṃ *kuñcikodghāṭam* (em. : *kruñcikodghāṭam* ABCDE) *eva ca* | *siddhacakraṃ prakāśaṃ ca paṭaṃ tūraṃ *tathāparam* (em : *yathāparaṃ* ABCDE) ‖ 1.32 *siddhakaulaṃ mahājālaṃ tathā bhairavagahvaram* | *kulagahvaranāmānaṃ kulaḍāmarabhairavam* ‖ 1.33 *jhāṅkārakulam atyugraṃ tathā siddhāmataṃ śubham* | *kācanāmatam evānyat kusumālikasaṃjñitam* ‖ 1.34 ***siddhayogeśvarītantraṃ*** *trikasārottaraṃ tathā* | ***picutantraṃ*** *mahāraudraṃ vimalocchuṣmasaṃjñitam* | 1.35 *khaḍgarāvaṇanāmānaṃ tathānyaṃ ṭakamaṇḍalam* (em. : *ṭakamaṇḍanam* ABCDE) | *karoṭī muṇḍamālākhyaṃ śiracchedaṃ bhayānakam* ‖ 1.36 *hāhārāvottaraṃ tantraṃ krodham unmattabhairavam* | *ruruyāmalam atyugraṃ tathānyaṃ rudrayāmalam* ‖ 1.37 *umāyāmalam evānyad gaurīyāmalam eva ca* | *skandayāmalam evānyaṃ tathā bhairavayāmalam* ‖ 1.38 *viṣṇuyāmalam eva syān nandiyāmalam eva ca* | *śukrayāmalam evānyac chakrayāmalam eva ca* ‖ 1.39 *kapālīśamataṃ nāma meghanādīśvaraṃ tathā* | ***haṃsayāmalanāmānaṃ*** *caṇḍograṃ hāṭakeśvaram* ‖ 1.40 *mahāvāmeśvarītantraṃ laṅkeśīmatam uttamam* | *lampaṭādyaṃ ca raktādyaṃ tathā haḍḍāmataṃ param* ‖ 1.41 *durvāsamatam evānyam evamādyā hy anekaśaḥ* | *ete tantravarāḥ proktā yoginīcakravanditāḥ* ‖ 1.42 *eṣu tantravareṣv eva tāsāṃ cāraṃ vicāritam*. The great majority of these works appear to have been lost. Works that have survived with titles listed here are distinguished by bold characters. Works here that are known only by citations or as loci of attribution in early colophons have been underlined.

Having dealt with this objection I can now turn to the evidence. In advance of a more thoroughgoing demonstration I consider a few passages here that reveal that the Buddhist redactors were using Śaiva materials and enable us to see how they did so.

I have mentioned the entry into the Cakrasaṃvara corpus of two lists of Śākta sacred sites. That found in the *Vajraḍāka*, ff. 42r1–43v3 (18.10–60) corresponds very closely in the Vidyāpīṭha to *Niśisaṃcāra*, ff. 16v–19v (4.6b–5.11), both in content and wording. The passage lists twenty-four sacred sites and identifies for each its presiding goddess, the high Tantric goddess to whose family she is assigned, her weapon (*āyudham*), the site's sacred tree, and a guardian Bhairava (*kṣetrapālaḥ*).[462] The version in the *Vajraḍāka* leaves

---

[461] The same applies to a line of defence that objects to my conclusion in a manner that renders even a non-specific engagement with the parallels unnecessary. Confronted with the information that such parallels have been claimed some are inclined to respond with the question "Why would Buddhists have drawn on Śaiva sources?" The question is purely rhetorical and somewhat plaintive, implying that since the authors of these texts were Buddhists they would surely not have drawn on non-Buddhist scriptures. The inference has no force at all, because it invokes a notion of the nature of Buddhism and consequently of what Buddhists can or cannot have done that is derived from texts other than those of this corpus. No amount of evidence that other Buddhist scriptures were free of dependence on non-Buddhist texts can counter evidence that these Buddhist scriptures were not.

[462] Closely related to the *Niśisaṃcāra* text is a version seen in *Kubjikāmata* 22.23–46, which lacks one of its elements, namely the specification of the high Tantric goddesses to whose families these local goddesses belong. Another, somewhat divergent and giving the sites alone and the points on the body that should be empowered by them through *nyāsaḥ*, appears in the Vidyāpīṭha's *Mādhavakula* (*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, f. 124r1–5 [*Kālikākule pūjānirṇayaḥ*, vv. 16–22 (followed in *Tantrāloka* 29.59–63 (TĀ): parts of a Kashmirian redaction of the text are cited in *Tantrālokaviveka* on these verses (TĀV)]; the procedure of the *nyāsaḥ* is put in Paddhati form in *Kālīkulakramārcana*, f. 22r5–v5 [KKK]): *aṭṭahāsaṃ śikhāsthāne caritraṃ ca karandhrake* | **kulagiryaṃ* (corr. : *kullagirye* Cod.) *priye* **karṇe* (corr. : *karṇṇaṃ* Cod.) **jayantyā* (corr. : *jayaṃtya* Cod.) **uttare punaḥ* (conj. [cf. *jayantīpīṭhapāda vāmakarṇe* KKK] : *uttaroyaṇe* Cod.) | 17 **ujjayanyā* (corr. : *ujjayanyāṃ* Cod.) *tu bhrūmadhye prayāgaṃ vaktramadhyagam* | *vārāṇasī tu hṛdaye śrīpīṭhaṃ skandhayor dvayoḥ* | 18 *kaṇṭhadeśe tu virajaṃ* **hy eruṇḍyā*

this Śaiva pantheon and its ancillaries intact, the only major deviation being that it has four sites that differ from those in the *Niśisaṃcāra*. Particularly striking in the *Vajraḍāka*'s version is not only the fact that it transmits all the details of this distinctively Śaiva religious map, which includes such well-known deities as Mahālakṣmī of Kollagiri (Kolhāpur), Hetuka[bhairava] of Devīkoṭṭa, and Vettāḍā/Vetālā of Nagara (Pāṭaliputra/Kusumapura),[463] but also that it preserves the classification of the goddesses of these sites as belonging to one or other of the families of Raktā, Karālī, Caṇḍākṣī, Mahocchuṣmā, Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktā, and Mahābalā, information that is revelant only in the Śaiva context, since these are the four Guhyakās and their attendants that form the inner retinue of Kapālīśabhairava and Caṇḍā Kāpālinī in the *Picumata* of the Vidyāpīṭha[464] and are not encountered to my knowledge in any Buddhist

---

(em. [cf. *eruṇḍīpīṭhapāda* | *udare* KKK] : *herumḍya* Cod.) *udare priye* | **alampuraṃ* (Cod. KKK : *alipuraṃ* TĀV : *hālā* TĀ) *nābhimadhye* **saṃdohailāpuraṃ priye* (Cod. [cf. *elāpurapīṭhapāda medasi* KKK] : *kandordhve parameśvari* TĀV) | 19 *kandādhāre tu gokarṇaṃ* **marudeśaṃ* (corr. : *maruddeśaṃ* Cod. : *marukośaṃ* TĀ) *bhagāntare* | *atha meḍhropari bhadre jñātavyaṃ sādhakena tu* | 20 *dakṣiṇe* **sakthni* (TĀV : *sakti* Cod.) **nagaraṃ* (corr. : *nagare* Cod.) **vāme syāt* (TĀV : *vāmeśyāḥ* Cod.) **pauṇḍravardhanam* (corr. TĀV : *pauḍravarddhane* Cod.) | *vāmaskandhe purastīraṃ* **pṛṣṭhāpuraṃ* (Cod. [cf. *pṛṣṭhāpurapīṭhapāda dakṣaskandhe* KKK] : *elāpuraṃ* TĀV) *tu dakṣiṇe* | 21 **kuḍyākeśī* (TĀV : *uḍyākeśī* Cod.) * *jānumadhye* (Cod. [cf. *kuṇḍakeśīpīṭhapāda jānumadhye* KKK] : *dakṣajānau* TĀV) **sopāraṃ* (Cod. : *sopānaṃ* TĀ TĀV) **cottare* (em. [=TĀV] : *cāntare* Cod.) *smṛtam* | **kṣīrikā* (corr. : *kṣīrikāṃ* Cod.) **vāmahaste* (Cod. [cf. *kṣīrikāpīṭhapāda vāmahaste* KKK] *tu* **māyāpuryā* (corr. : *māyāpuryān* Cod.) *tu dakṣiṇe* | 22 *āmrātakeśvaraṃ gulphe vāme rājagṛhaṃ śubham* | *pādādhāre tu brahmāṇī kālāgnyavadhidhārakī*.

[463] The name of the goddess of this city is Vettavāsinī in the *Niśisaṃcāra* (f. 17v [4.43]; em. : *veṭṭavāsinī* Cod.) Vetrakacchanivāsā in the *Kubjikāmata* (22.37c; em. [MSS E and K] : *cetrakacchanivāsā* BCDJG : *caitrakacchanivāsā* Ed.), and Vetrā in the *Kālikākulakramārcana* (em. : *vatrā* Cod.). In the Buddhist version we see Vettāḍā in the *Vajraḍāka* (em. : *vettaheti* Cod.) and Vetāḍā in the *Ḍākārṇava*. The *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu (p. 16, l. 2 to p. 17, l. 4) independently identifies her as 'the Kātyāyayanī called Vetālā': *kusumapuraṃ . . . yatra . . . kātyāyanī vetālābhidhā*. We therefore have two phonetically related but semantically unrelated names, one meaning the goddess 'who dwells in the thicket of reeds (*vetra-*)' and the other 'the female Vetāla', *vettāḍa-* and *vetāḍa-* being well-attested variant forms of *vetāla-*. I propose that the latter evolved from the former through a vernacular synonym *Vettālā corresponding to Sanskrit Vetrālayā. Cf. Panjābī and Hindī *ālā* from Skt. *ālayaḥ*; Panjābī *śivālā*, Maithilī and Hindī *siwālā* from Skt. *śivālayaḥ*; and Panjābī *dewālā* from Skt. *devālayaḥ*. The Mahāyānist *Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra*'s *Candragarbhasūtra*, preserved only in a Chinese translation made by Narendrayaśas in 566, gives in its 18th chapter (*Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra*, chapter 55) a listing of the presiding deities of 55 places extending from India through Central Asia to China (55a–58a [prose]; 59a–60a [verse resumé]). The name of the guardian goddess of Pāṭaliputra is said there to be Bi-lu-chi or Bi-lu-tuo (LÉVI 1905b, p. 265). It is tempting to see this as a deformation of the same name caused by an inadvertent inversion of the last two syllables. But I am not qualified to judge the matter.

[464] See, e.g., *Picumata* f. 19r2–3 (4.254c–256): *guhyakādyaṃ tato vakṣye nāmato*

context outside this text-passage and its derivatives. Thus, for example, the *Niśisaṃcāra* (4.10–13), covering Kolāgiri (Kolhāpur) and Jayantī, reads:

10 ***kolāgiryā<ṃ> mahālakṣmī karālā****yonisaṃbhavā* |
kālarūpā sthitā devī daṇḍahastā subhīṣaṇā ||
11 *tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi parvatāgrasamāśritā* |
agnike*ti ca vikhyātaḥ kṣetrapālo mahātape* ||
12 ***jayantyā<ṃ> danturā****yoni<r>* ***jvālāmukhe****ti viśrutā* |
khaḍgahastā sthitā devi sarvasattvabhayaṃkarī ||
13 *tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi nimbavṛkṣasamāśritā* |
mahāprete*ti vikhyātas tasmin kṣetre mahābalaḥ* ||

ff. 16v4–17r3

13a *tasmin kṣetre* corr. : *tasmiṃ kṣetrā* Cod.

and the corresponding passage in the *Vajraḍāka* (18.12–14) reads:

12 ***kollagiryāṃ mahālakṣmī karālā****yonisaṃbhavā* |
karālarūpā sthitā devi vikṛtā cātibhīṣaṇā ||
13 *tasmin nagare sthitā cogrā parvatāgrasamāśritā* |[465]

---

varṇatas tathā || 255 *raktā karālī* **caṇḍākhyā* (corr. : *caṇḍākhyāṃ* Cod.) *mahocchuṣmā tathaiva ca* | *ucchuṣmatantre nāmāni guhyakānāṃ na saṃśayaḥ* || 256 *karālā danturā caiva bhīmavaktrā mahābalā* | *guhyakānucarā hy etāḥ kiṃkaryo 'nukrameṇa tu* 'Next I shall explain the [retinue] that begins with the Guhyakās, giving their names and colours. In [this scripture,] the *Ucchuṣmatantra*, the names of the Guhyakās are, without doubt, Raktā, Karālī, Caṇḍākhyā (/Caṇḍākṣī), and Mahocchuṣmā. Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktrā, and Mahābalā: these are respectively their attendant servants'. The *Ucchuṣmatantra* is the *Picumata* itself (f. 185r4: *ity ucchuṣmatantre picumate nāḍīsaṃcārapaṭalaḥ ṣaṭtriṃśatimaḥ*). The four secondary goddesses that attend the Guhyakās are also called their Dūtīs. I have not emended *caṇḍākhyāṃ*, because although Caṇḍākṣī is the standard form of the name there are several other places in this text in which the goddess is called Caṇḍākhyā.

[465] Both the *Niśisaṃcāra* and the *Vajraḍāka* read *parvatāgrasamāśritā* (*rDo rje mkha' 'gro* f. 49r7: *ri yi rtse mor brten te gnas*) 'on a hilltop' here. This is surprising because what we expect is a reference to the site's sacred tree, as in the parallel expression *nimbavṛkṣasamāśritā* 'by a Nimba tree' in the next verse. It is tempting to emend, therefore to *parpaṭāgrasamāśritā* 'in front of a Box [tree]', since this is so close to the transmitted reading. However, two considerations oppose this: (1) in a passage on Kollāgiri in the *Picumata* (f. 7r3–4 [3.84–87]), which agrees in giving Mahālakṣmī as the goddess, Agnika as the Kṣetrapāla, and *daṇḍaḥ* as the weapon, the sacred tree of the site is said to be a Vaibhītaka (84 *dakṣiṇena likhen mantrī mahāghoraṃ bhayāvaham* | *mahāraudraṃ śmaśānaṃ tu nāmnā kollagirī tathā* || 85 *tatra daṇḍaṃ samālikhya madhye vaibhītakadrumam* | *nānāvṛkṣasamākīrṇaṃ kollāgiryoparis tathā* || 86 *citibhiḥ prajvalantībhiḥ samantāt parivāritam* | *dikṣuś caiva vidikṣuś ca bahis tasya mahāyaśe* || 87 *tasyādhastāl likhet padmam aṣṭapatraṃ sakarṇikam* | *agnikaṃ kṣetrapālaṃ tu mahālakṣmībhayāvaham*); and (2) in the *Kubjikāmata*'s parallel version of this material Mahālakṣmī is described as 'residing on a hill' (22.25: *ag-*

agnimukhe*ti vikhyātaḥ kṣetrapālo varānanaḥ* |
14 ***jvālāmukhī****ti vikhyātā* |
khaḍgahastā sthitā ghorā nimbavṛkṣasamāśritā |
kṣetrapālo mahākāyo ***mahāvrate****ti viśrutaḥ* ||

f. 42r2–4

13c *vikhyātaḥ* corr. : *vikhyātā* Cod. 14b *khaḍgahastā sthitā* em. : *khaḍgahastasthitā* Cod.

Moreover, this Buddhist parallel provides additional evidence of the direction of redaction through the state of verse 14. For it lacks the first quarter, which contained information vital to the coherence of the passage, namely the name of the site over which the goddess Jvālāmukhī presides and the goddess of the *Picumata* to whose family she is assigned. As a result of this error, committed either by a Buddhist redactor or inherited from a defective Śaiva manuscript, what was originally the second quarter has become the first. Aware that the metrical cadences required at the end of first and second quarters of a verse in this metre are different the redactor has removed the resulting metrical blemish by substituting the synonym *vikhyātā* for *viśrutā*. But this was not enough, since to mend the unmetrical mess that resulted from the omission he would have had also to recast the quarters that follow. This was evidently beyond his competence or required more effort than he thought necessary. The result is a verse with five quarters (a, a, b, a, b) or one and a half verses of which the first half verse consists of a prior quarter without the posterior quarter required to complete it.

As for the four sites found in the *Vajraḍāka*'s version but not in the *Niśisaṃcāra*, namely Uḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, Tibet, and Mālava, there can be little doubt that the presence of the third is the work of a Buddhist redactor, since Tibet had no religious significance for the Śaivas but much for the Buddhists from the eight century onwards. As for the other three, their presence might be explained by assuming that the direct source of the *Vajraḍāka*'s passage was not the *Niśisaṃcāra* as we find it in its single surviving Nepalese manuscript but rather a closely related redaction either within another version of the *Niśisaṃcāra*, such as we find in the paraphrases and citations of a work of this name in the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha's commentary,[466]

---

nikena samopetāṃ daṇḍahastāṃ nagaukasām | *kolāgirye mahālakṣmīṃ naumi lakṣmīvivardhanīm*). The hypermetrical reading *karālarūpā* in 12c, which was also that of the Tibetan translation (*rDo rje mkha' 'gro* f. 49r6: *gtsigs pa'i gzugs can*), is no doubt an error for *kālarūpā*, echoing *karālā* in the preceding quarter.

[466] See the paraphrase of the *Niśisaṃcāra*'s treatment of these twenty-four Śākta sacred sites in *Tantrāloka* 15.88–97b and the direct citations in Jayaratha's commentary on these verses. These show a list that differs somewhat from that found in the Nepalese manuscripts. The latter has Aṭṭahāsa, Caritra,

or within some other Śaiva source. However, this is improbable in the light of the *Vajraḍāka*'s treatments of all four of these sites. For what they have in common is that they deviate from the pattern of the rest of the passage in that their presiding goddesses, Mahādevī of Uḍḍiyāna, Caṇḍālinī of Jālandhara, Sahajā of Tibet, and Sekā of Mālava, are not assigned to one or other of the eight goddesses of the *Picumata*. Instead, in the case of the first three the redactor has filled in the text at these points by assigning them to the families of Guhyā (*guhyākhyāyonisaṃbhavā*), Soma (*somasaṃbhava*), and Svayambhū (*svayambhuyonisambhavā*), and in the case of the fourth omitting to assign her to any deity.[467] Why he chose these names is unknown to me. Only one is a goddess and not one of them is of any significance in Tantric Buddhism, unless the Svayambhū intended is that of the famous Svayambhūcaitya of Kathmandu. It seems likely that he supplied these names at random in order to maintain the compositional structure. In any case, since it would have been an easy task to insert names from among those of the eight goddesses that structure his Śaiva source, it is evident that they meant nothing to him.

The other list of sacred places appears in *Laghuśaṃvara* 41.6–15. The verses first list these places (6–8b) and then state the classes of Yoginīs and other female supernaturals said to be present in them, though without covering them all.[468] The Śaiva source, or rather a later redactional variant of it, is seen in the following passage in the *Tantrasadbhāva*:

Kolāgiri, Jayantī, Ujjayinī, Prayāga, Varaṇā, and Koṭīvarṣa (/Devīkoṭṭa) (the eight Kṣetras); Vīraja, Eruḍī, Hatapura, Elāpura, Gokarṇa, Marukeśvara, Nagara (Pāṭaliputra), and Puṇḍravardhana (the eight Saṃdohas); and Parastīra, Pṛṣṭhapura, Kuṇḍī, Choṣmāra, Kṣīrika, Māyāpurī, Āmrātikeśvara, and Rājagṛha (the eight Upakṣetras). The list in the redaction known to Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha has Prayāga, Varaṇā, Aṭṭahāsa, Jayantī, Vārāṇasī, Kaliṅga, Kulūtā, and Lāhulā (the eight Kṣetras); Virajā, Eruḍī, Hālā, Elāpura, Kṣīrapurī, Nagara, Māyāpurī, and Marudeśa (the eight Saṃdohas); and Jālandhara, Nepāla, Kaśmīra, Gargikā, Hara, Mlecchadigdvāravṛtti, Kurukṣetra, and Kheṭaka (the eight Upasaṃdohas). It is striking that this introduces a number of Himalayan regions, namely Kulūtā (Kulu), Lāhulā (Lahul), Nepāla, Kaśmīra, and also Gargikā, if that refers to Garhwal. Mlecchadigdvāravṛtti 'the pass (?) to the region of the barbarians' is also likely to refer to a location in the Himalaya or Hindu Kush.

[467] *Vajraḍāka* f. 43r1–2 (18.43): **oḍyāyane* **mahādevī* (corr. : *mahādevi* Cod.) *guhyākhyāyonisaṃbhavā* | *vajraśṛṅkhaladharā devyā sughorā divyarūpiṇī*; f. 43r2–3 (18.45): *jālandhare tu caṇḍālinī jñeyā mudra kaṭṭārikodyatā* | *somasambhava mahādevi sarvaiśvarya*pradāyikā* (em. : *dāyikā* Cod.); f. 43r7–v1 (18.55): *bhoṭaviṣaye sahajākhyā makaradhvajadhāriṇī* | *svayambhuyonisambhavā saumyāsyā divyarūpiṇī*; f. 43v1–2 (18.57): *mālave tu tathā sekā mudrāmudgara*dhāriṇī* (corr. : *dhāraṇī* Cod.) | *sādhakānāṃ *priyā* (corr. : *prayā* Cod.) *nityaṃ †jasasvini prasāsyāḥ†syuḥ*.

[468] A related system of thirty-two sacred sites is taught in *Hevajra* 1.6.10–19, and, with some differences, in *Mahāmudrātilaka*, Paṭala 10 (ff. 17v1–20v5).

kulūtāyām araṇyeśe sindhudeśe nageśvare ||
62 *samudrakukṣyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretapuryāṃ himālaye* |
kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge kauśale sthale ||
63 *triśakunis tathā cauḍre kāmarūpe ca mālave* |
devīkoṭṭe sudhārāme godāvaryās taṭe 'rbude ||
64 *eṣu deśeṣu yāḥ kanyāḥ striyo vā klinnayonayaḥ* |
sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpiṇyo manoveganuvṛttayaḥ ||
65 *śeṣeṣu yās samutpannāḥ śākinyo ghoramātaraḥ* |
ṣaḍ yoginyaḥ kulūtāyāṃ araṇyeśe ca mātarāḥ ||
66 *sindhudeśe bhaginyas tu nageśe kulanāyikāḥ* |
samudrakukṣyāṃ kāmpilyaḥ saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ ||
67 *pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavadgirau* |
kāñcyām ambāḥ samākhyātā lampākaviṣaye 'mṛtāḥ ||
68 *kaliṅge vratadhāriṇyaḥ kauśale piśitāśanāḥ* |
cakravākyāḥ sthale proktās triśakunyāmarāḥ smṛtāḥ ||
69 *deśadvaye ca śākinyo nāyikā vīranāyikā<ḥ>* |
. . .
126 *yāś cānyāś ca vinirdiṣṭā raudrā bhairavamātaraḥ* |
mahāmanthānarudras tu tāsāṃ maṇḍalanāyakaḥ[469] ||

ff. 109v5–110r1, 111v1 (16.61c–69a, 16.126)

62a *samudrakukṣyāṃ* corr. : *samudrakukṣyā* Cod. 62c *kāñcyāṃ* em. : *kaṃcyā* Cod. 63a *cauḍre* corr. : *coḍre* Cod. 64a *eṣu* em. : *eṣa* Cod. 68b *triśakunyāmarāḥ* conj. [Aiśa Sandhi for *triśakunyām amarāḥ*] : *trisaṃyāmarāḥ* Cod.

The corresponding passage of the *Laghuśaṃvara* is not present in the incomplete Sanskrit manuscript accessible to me, since the folios that contained it, covering 38.13c to the end of Paṭala 44, are among those it lacks. But it can be restored with some confidence, except in the matter of the presence or absence of a few particles, by combining the evidence of the Tibetan translation,[470] the lemmata in the surviving Sanskrit commentaries, and a rewriting of parts of the passage in the *Vajraḍāka*:[471]

---

[469] The fact that the text of 69ab and 126 are contiguous in the Buddhist version indicates that the Śaiva text on which it drew was not the *Tantrasadbhāva*, at least not in its surviving redaction, but an earlier source to which 69c–125, which contain a further, much longer list of Sthānayoginīs and their classification as belonging to the families of one or other of the seven Mothers (*sapta mātṛkulāni*), have been added. The alternative, that the Buddhist redactor removed this section because he had no use for this list and its scheme of classification, is not impossible. However, it seems unlikely that in that case he would have taken the special trouble of retaining 126. It is not needed to complete the sense and proved awkward to integrate because he had it in what was evidently an already corrupted form.

[470] *bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 238v1–5 (= *Laghuśaṃvara* 41.6–15): *kuluta dang dgon pa dang* | *si ndhu'i yul dang grong khyer dbang* | *gser gyi gling dang sau rā ṣṭa* | *de bzhin lha yi khyim dang ni* | *yi dags grong dang kha ba'i gnas* | *kā ñci 'am la mpā ka yi yul* | *ka li ngga dang ko sa la* | *tri sha ku ne o tre dang* | *kā ma rū pa mā la wa lha mo'i mkhar dang rā ma'i dbang* | *go da ba ri a rbu da* | *au ḍya na dzā la ndhar dang*

41.6 *kulatāyāṃ araṇye ca sindhudeśe nagareśvare |*
suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre ***tathā ca gṛhadevatā***
pretapuryāṃ himālaye ||
7 *kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge c[aiva] kosale |*
triśakunis tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave ||
8 *devīkoṭṭe rāmeśvare godāvaryāṃ [tathā]rbude |*
oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramalayādiṣu *||*
9 *eteṣu deśeṣu kanyā yā vīrādvayavyāpinī |*
sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpiṇyo manoveganivṛttayaḥ ||
10 *ṣaḍ yoginyaḥ kulatāyāṃ marudeśe ca mātarāḥ |*
sindhudeśe [ca] lāmās tu nagare kulanāyikāḥ |
11 *lampāke saurāṣṭre kuladevatāḥ |*
pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo ḍākinī saha rūpiṇī ||
12 *himagirau kāñcyāṃ sabālikāḥ |*
pañcālaviṣaye ***gṛhadevatā*** *||*
13 *kaliṅge vratadhāriṇyaḥ kośale piśitāśanāḥ |*
pretapuryāṃ vajraḍākyaḥ sthaleśvare ||
14 *triśakunyāṃ [ca] amarāḥ pullīramalaye |*
kanakagirau antyajāḥ striyaḥ sahasrāṇy ekaviṃśatiḥ ||

| pu llī ra ma la ya sogs | yul 'di dag gi bu mo gang | dpa' bo gnyis med rnal 'byor ma | de kun 'dod pa'i gzugs can te | yid kyi shugs kyis 'jug pa yis | rnal 'byor ma drug ku lu tar | myang ma yul na ma mo rnams | si ndhu'i yul na lā ma ste | rigs kyi gtso mo na ga rar | la mpā ka dang sau rā ṣṭra | rigs kyi lha mo rnams yin no | yi dags grong dang nags chen por | mkha' 'gro rū pi ka ru bcas | kha ba'i ri dang kā ñcir ni | byis bcas ma ru bshad pa ste | pā ñca la yi yul dag na | khyim gyi lha mo ka li nggar | brtul zhugs 'dzin pa rnams yin no | ko sa lar ni sha za ba | yi dags grong du de bzhin du | rdo rje mkha' 'gro sbom dbang phyug | tri sha ku ner du ma skyes ma | pu li ra ma la ya de bzhin | gser rir sme sha can rigs skyes | bud med stong phrag nyi shu gcig | lhag ma gzhan dag ji snyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | 'khor lo'i rnal 'byor ma yin no | he ru ka dpal sbyor ba che de yi dkyil 'khor gtso mo yin.

[471] *Vajraḍāka* f. 41v3–6 (18.3c–10b): *ṣaḍ yoginyas tu sādhakāḥ mlecchabhāṣaṃ tu bhāṣitam* | 18.4 *kulatāyāṃ tu marudeśe ca yā mātarāḥ* || *sindhau ca nagare* **ca yāḥ* (corr. : *caryā* Cod.) *kulanāyikāḥ* | 18.5 *lampāke saurāṣṭre yā<ḥ> kuladevatāḥ* | *himagirau* **kāñcyāṃ yāḥ sabālikāḥ* (em. : *kāñcāyāṃ yā bālikā* Cod.) | 18.6 *pañcāla gṛhadevatāyāṃ yā kanyā sahajarūpiṇī* | *kaliṅge* **kośale* (corr. : *kauśale* Cod.) *caiva vratadhāriṇī* **piśitāśanā* (em. : *pisitāsinā* Cod.) | 18.7 *pretapuryāṃ triśakunau ca sthūleśvarī khaṇḍa***rohikā* (em. : *rohitā* Cod.) *sthitā* | **pūrṇagirau* (corr. : *puṇṇagirau* Cod.) *jālandhare caṇḍālajāḥ striyaḥ* | 18.8 *oḍre kāmarūpe ca mahākanyāḥ devikoṭe rāmeśvare ca yā kanyā matā* | **godāvaryām arbude ca* (corr. : *godāvaryāṃbude va* Cod.) *ḍākinī parameśvarī* | 18.9 *suvarṇadvīpa<ṃ>* **yathoddiṣṭaṃ* (corr. : *yathodhiṣṭaṃ* Cod.) *uḍyāyanaṃ tathaiva ca* | *eteṣu deśeṣu yā kanyā vīrādvayavyāpinī* | 18.10 *sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpiṇyo* **manoveganivṛttayaḥ* (corr. : *manovegonivṛttayaḥ* Cod.).

15 *anyāpi śeṣāś ca yāvatyaḥ śrīherukasya yoginī |*
mahāmanthāna tāsāṃ maṇḍalanāyikā ||

The words within square brackets are purely conjectural

TESTIMONIA: BhBh = Bhavabhaṭṭa ad loc.; DG = Devagupta ad loc.; JBh = Jayabhadra ad loc.; KP = Kambalapāda ad loc.; Tib. = *bDe mchog nyung ngu*; VḌ = *Vajraḍāka* f. 41v3–6 (18.3c–10b).

LEMMATA: **6a** *kulatāyām ityādinā* BhBh • *araṇyaṃ marubhūmiḥ* JBh **6d** *gṛhadevateti saptamīlopāt* BhBh **8a** *āraṇo rāmeśvaraḥ* JBh **8cd** *oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramalayā ādibhūtā yeṣāṃ ta oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramalayādayo 'rbudādayaḥ* BhBh; *pullīramalayo na nirdiṣṭaḥ* JBh **9ab** *eteṣu deśeṣu* KP, BhBh, VḌ • *yā kanyā vīrādvayavyāpinī* VḌ, BhBh, KP; *bu mo gang dpa' bo gnyis med rnal 'byor ma* (*yā kanyā vīrādvayayoginī*) Tib.; **9c** *kāmarūpiṇya iti* BhBh, VḌ **9d** *manoveganivṛttaya iti* BhBh, KP, VḌ **10a** *ṣaḍ yoginyaḥ* BhBh, KP, JBh, VḌ **10b** *marudeśe* BhBh, KP • *mātārā iti* BhBh; *mātaraḥ kākāsyādyāḥ* JBh **10ab** *kulatāyāṃ marudeśe ca mātaretyādi* KP, VḌ **10c** *lāmās tv iti* JBh; *lāmā iti* BhBh **10d** *kulanāyikāḥ* JBh, BhBh **11ab** *la mpā ka dang sau rā ṣṭra* Tib.; *lampāke saurāṣṭre yā<ḥ> kuladevatāḥ* VḌ; *lampāyāṃ saurāṣṭre kuladevatāḥ* BhBh; **11c** *mahākālo mahābhairavaḥ* **11cd** *pretapuryāṃ mahākanyā ḍākinīsaharūpiṇīti* BhBh; *ḍākinībhir iti sahārthe tṛtīyā | kiṃbhūtābhiḥ saha | rūpiṇyaḥ | rūpiṇīty anyā rūpiṇyaś cumbikāsabālikāprabhṛtayaḥ pṛthagbhūtāḥ saha rūpiṇībhir iti draṣṭavyāḥ* **12ab** *himagirau kāñcyāṃ sabālikā iti* BhBh **12cd** *pañcālaviṣaye* ! *gṛhadevatā gṛhadevatāyām* BhBh; *pañcāla iti* JBh **13a** *ka li nggar | brtul zhugs 'dzin pa rnams yin no* (*kaliṅge vratadhāriṇyaḥ*) Tib.; *kaliṅge ca vratadhāriṇyaḥ* BhBh **13b** *kośale piśitāśanāḥ* BhBh **13cd** *pretapuryāṃ vajraḍākinyaḥ* BhBh **14bcd** *pullīramalaye kanakagirāv iti | ihāntyajāḥ striyaḥ | sahasrāṇy ekaviṃśatir iti bāhulyasūcanārtham* BhBh; *sahasrāṇy ekaviṃśatir iti* KP **15ab** *śeṣānyeṣu yāvatyaḥ śrīherukacakrayoginītyādi* KP, BhK (*lhag ma gzhan dag ji snyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | 'khor lo'i rnal 'byor ma yin no*), DG (*lhag ma gzhan rnams ji snyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | 'khor lo'i rnal 'byor ma yin no*); *śeṣānyeṣu hi yāvantya iti | śrīherukasya yoginīti prathamābahuvacanalope* BhBh; *anyā api śeṣāś ca devatyaḥ śrīherukayoginyaḥ* JBh (cf. DG: *lha mo gzhan dag ji snyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | zhes bya ba la sogs pa smos so | ji ltar zhen | he ru ka yi sbyor chen las | de yi dkyil 'khor gtso mo yin | zhes bya ba la sogs pa la*) **15cd** *mahāmanthāna iti śrīherukasya manthānayogyāḥ | tāsām iti nirdhāraṇe ṣaṣṭhī | maṇḍalanāyikā iti tricakravartinyaś caturviṃśatir ḍākinyaḥ* JBh; *mahāmanthānaṃ prajñopāyasvarūpatvam upāyo vā | tenānvitaḥ śrīherukaḥ prajñārūpaḥ tasya saṃbandhinīnāṃ tāsāṃ madhye maṇḍalanāyikā vajravārāhī samāpanneti bhāvaḥ | mahāmanthānaṃ nirmāṇaṃ nirvibhaktikaṃ | tāsāṃ nirmāṇaṃ śrīherukenaiva saṃpādyaṃ yataḥ | śrīherukamahāmudrāmaṇḍalanāyiketi kecit* BhBh

In the Buddhist version the total of twenty-one sites has been raised by the addition of Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullīramalaya at the end of the first section (8cd). The reason for the addition is not made explicit in the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself; but the fourth Paṭala had listed twenty-four Yoginīs from Mahāvīryā to Pracaṇḍā;[472] and in the ritual system followed by the commentators and the corpus of explanatory Tantras the sacred sites, as we have seen, are likewise twenty-four because each is the location of one of these Yoginīs. We have evidence of two stages in the modification of the text that produced this result. For the earlier redaction, attested by Jayabhadra, states that Pullīramalaya is not mentioned in this passage but must be understood to be included.[473] It is clear then that his text mentioned only Oḍḍiyāna and Jālandhara in addition to the twenty-one of the Śaiva source. Jayabhadra does not cite the actual wording of the insertion, and no other indications allow us to establish it. However, it is unlikely that the redactor took the trouble of stretching his interpolation of

---

[472] *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 4v4–6: **tato* (JAYABHADRA : *tataḥ* Cod.) *ḍākinyo bhuvanāni vijṛmbhayanti* | 4.1 *mahāvīryā cakravartinī mahābalā suvīrā cakravarmiṇī* |

śauṇḍinī khaṇḍarohā cakravegā khagānanā || 2 *haya*karṇā* (corr. : *varṇṇā* Cod.) *subhadrā ca *śyāmādevī* (corr. : *syāmāthavī* Cod.) *tathaiva ca* | *surābhakṣī vāyuvegā tathā mahābhairavā* || 3 *airāvatī drumacchāyā laṅkeśvarī kharvarī tathā* | *vīramatī mahānāsā prabhāvatī caiva caṇḍākṣī pracaṇḍā ca sādhakaḥ* || 4 *etāḥ siddhās tu vai pūrvaṃ caturviṃśati ḍākinyaḥ*. This list too has parallels in the Vidyāpīṭha, though I have found only partial matches. Thus the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* of *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, gives the following list of twenty-four Yoginīs whose names when uttered draw in the Śmaśānabhūtas (f. 202r5–7 [9.58–61]): *śarabhān<an>ā* ***suvīrā*** *ca vajribhā *rāsabhā* (conj. : *rāsibhā* Cod.) *tathā* | ****cakravartī*** (corr. : *cakravarti* Cod.) *ca* ****śauṇḍī*** (em. : *pauṇḍī* Cod.) *ca khaḍgakarṇā mahātapā* || 59 ***cakravegā*** *mahāyāmyā* ***subhadrā*** *gajakarṇikā* | *carā vai somadevī ca gavākṣī vāyuvegagā* || 60 ***airāvatī mahānāsā*** *daṃṣṭrālī ca sukarkaśā* | *vedhanī ca tathā bhaṭṭā droṇā kākenakā tathā* || 61 *yatra nāmāni yoginām uccāryante mahātape* | *tatra śmaśānabhūtāś ca sāṃnidhyaṃ yā<n>ti tatkṣaṇāt*. The eight names in bold characters are those that are among the twenty-four of the *Laghuśaṃvara*. Compare also the names Śarabhānanā, Khaḍgakarṇā, Gajakarṇikā, and Somadevī with the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s Khagānanā, Hayakarṇā, and Śyāmādevī. The names of four of the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s Ḍākinīs are found among the fourteen inner goddesses of the *Picumata*, i.e., the four Guhyakās, their four Dūtis, and the six Yoginīs, namely Caṇḍākṣī (the third Guhyakā), Mahābalā (the fourth Dūtī), and Cakravegā and Mahānāsā (the fifth and sixth Yoginīs). For the first eight see 4.254c–256 cited here p. 193. For the six Yoginīs see f. 19r3 (4.257): *kroṣṭukī vijayā caiva gajakarṇā mahāmukhī* | ***cakravegā mahānāsā*** *ṣaḍ yoginyaḥ prakīrtitāḥ*. **Suvīrā** appears in *Kubjikāmata* 21.45c and *Matasāra* f. 138r1, **Khagānanā** as one of the eight Śāktasiddhās of the Kālīkula/Krama, **Laṅkeśvarī** in *Matasāra* f. 81r1 as one of eight Yoginīs in a variant of the inner retinue of the *Picumata*, and **Prabhāvatī** in *Kubjikāmata* 11.115a and 12.23b.

[473] See here p.158. Kāṇha, *Yogaratnamālā* on *Hevajra* 1.7.12, identifies Pullīramalaya with Pūrṇagiri and that appears in its place in listings of these sacred places in later texts of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, as in *Saṃvarodaya* 9.14. In the treatment of the thirty-two sacred sites of the Hevajra system in the tenth Paṭala of the *Mahāmudrātilaka* we find Pūrṇagiri and Pullīra denoting the same place (f. 17r5–v1: *oḍiyānaṃ pīṭham ākhyātaṃ pīṭhaṃ jālandharaṃ smṛtam* | *pīṭhaṃ* ***pūrṇagiriś*** *caiva kāmarūpaṃ tathaiva ca* … f. 18r1–2: *śirasi sthitaṃ vajrapīṭhaṃ śikhāyāṃ jādisaṃjñitam* | ***pullīraṃ*** *mastake jñeyaṃ bhrūmadhye kāmarūpakam*). On the location of Pūrṇagiri, in the Deccan, see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 298–299. In Śākta Śaiva sources it is one of the principal Pīṭhas and is often referred to, but never under the name Pullīramalaya/Pullīra.

the names of these two places to fill a whole line (8cd).[474] The later reading, *oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramayādiṣu*, attested by the Tibetan translation and by the lemmata in the commentaries of Bhavyakīrti and Bhavabhaṭṭa, supplies the missing Pullīramalaya and, incidentally, is an almost metrical half-verse: its first half (*oḍḍiyānajālandhara*) is unmetrical, but the second is not, and together they provide the required total of sixteen syllables. As for the meaning of the insertion, ordinary usage suggests that it is 'Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, Pullīramalaya, and others'. But that would not sit well with the closed list of twenty-four Yoginīs to which the sacred places were required to correspond. Thus it has been interpreted by Bhavabhaṭṭa to mean 'beginning with Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullīramalaya', this compound with its locative plural ending being read as qualifying the twenty-one sites, each listed in the common text with actual or virtual locative singular endings. Thus we have twenty-four Yoginīs in twenty-four sites. All that was needed to make this fit the system known to the commentators was to claim that the *Laghuśaṃvara* is deliberately concealing the true order of the items, both the names of the Yoginīs in Paṭala 4[475] and the names of the sacred sites in Paṭala 41. For in their system that order is not Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullīramalaya followed by the twenty-one from Kulutā to Arbuda, as the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself indicates, but the added three in reverse order followed by the twenty-one in reverse order, with the order of the Yoginīs also reversed, so that the true sequence is from Pracaṇḍā in Pullīramalaya to Mahāvīryā in Arbuda.[476]

---

[474] The frequent deviations from correct metrical form in this corpus create the impression that the redactors were largely indifferent to this aspect of composition, happily inserting and deleting without feeling the need to rewrite the result to conform to the rules of the Anuṣṭubh metre. The alternative, that they lacked not the inclination but the ability to do so, seems to me less likely. In the texts of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha, even when the Sanskrit is of a register well below that of the learned, the metrical structure is generally sound. Indeed since we find forms from both learned and scriptural (Aiśa) registers used in the same texts it seems that by drawing on both the redactors were not only asserting that their compositions were divine rather than human utterances but also making the task of metrical composition easier for themselves by using an Aiśa form that fitted the metre when the Paninian would not, as, for example, in the case of the not infrequent use of Aiśa genitives plural in *-ām* in place of the Paninian *-ānām*.

[475] On the passage listing the twenty-four Yoginīs/Ḍākinīs in Paṭala 4 Jayabhadra comments (*Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 115): *tricakravyavasthitānāṃ ḍākinīnāṃ pṛthak pṛthaṅ nāmāni kathyante* | *mahāvīryetyādinā vilomena kathitam* 'The names of each of the Ḍākinīs that occupy the three circuits are now taught. This has been done in the reverse order, beginning with Mahāvīryā [and ending with Pracaṇḍā]'. The order in which Mahāvīryā is the last and Pracaṇḍā the first, the order of their ritual application, is, however, indicated later in the text, in f. 35r7 (48.13): *yoginyaḥ pracaṇḍādayas tathā*.

[476] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, f. 126v1–3 (Ed. p. 547): *oḍḍiyānajālandhara-*

Most of the few other differences between the version in *Laghuśaṃvara* 41 and that seen in the Śaiva source are of little significance. But there is one that is more revealing. The *Tantrasadbhāva* has Sthala between Kosala and Triśakuni (16.62c–63b: *kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge kauśale* ***sthale*** *| **triśakunis** tathā caudre kāmarūpe ca mālave*), whereas the *Laghuśaṃvara* lacks it (41.7: *kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge c[aiva] kosale | **triśakunis** tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave*), and instead between Saurāṣṭra and Pretapurī has Gṛhadevatā (41.6: *kulatāyāṃ araṇye ca sindhudeśe nagareśvare | suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre* ***tathā ca gṛhadevatā*** *pretapuryāṃ himālaye*), which the *Tantrasadbhāva* lacks (16.61c–62b: *kulūtāyām araṇyeśe sindhudeśe nageśvare | samudrakukṣyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretapuryāṃ himālaye*). Two features are immediately obvious here. The first is that the additional words *tathā ca gṛhadevatā* have been added to an otherwise metrically correct verse with the result that it has five Pādas rather than the required four, with the fourth and fifth both with the cadence restricted to the second and fourth Pādas of the Anuṣṭubh, thus crudely violating the required metrical alternation of evenly and unevenly numbered Pādas that is hallmark of this metre. The second is that Gṛhadevatā, meaning 'household deity' is a most implausible place name. The key to the mistake, which became a permanent part of the ritual system of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, is in the second part of the passage in the version of the *Tantrasadbhāvá*, which tells the reader the classes of supernaturals that are present in the sacred sites. For there *gṛhadevatāḥ* 'household deities' are said to be present in Saurāṣṭra in a verse in which the items Saurāṣṭra, *gṛhadevatāḥ*, and Pretapurī are stated in that order (16.66c–67b: *samudrakukṣyāṃ kāmpilyas* ***saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ*** *| pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavadgirau* 'In Samudrakukṣī Kāmpilīs, in Saurāṣṭra Gṛhadevatās, in Pretapurī Mahākālīs, in Himālaya Rūpiṇīs'). Evidently the redactor has read the sequence *saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ pretapuryāṃ* as though these were three sites rather than one site followed by its resident supernaturals and another site. Probably his manuscript read *gṛhadevatā* rather than *gṛhadevatāḥ* and he took it as a stem-form to be understood as locative, a licence of kind seen elsewhere in both the *Laghuśaṃvara* and its Śaiva sources, as, apparently, in the unmetrical insertion that this error prompted: *suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca gṛhadevatā pretapuryāṃ himālaye*. Bhavabhaṭṭa duly comments on the occurrence of *gṛhadevatā* in that

---

*pullīramalayā ādibhūtā yeṣāṃ ta oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramalayādayo 'rbudādayaḥ kulatāntāḥ | bhāvaś cāyaṃ *pullīramalayam ādiṃ* (Cod. : *pullīramalayādiṃ* Ed.) *kṛtvā jālandharauḍḍiyānārbudādiṣu santīty upadeśārtham vyatikramanirdeśaḥ | etena maṇḍale śarīre ca pullīramalayādiṣu yoginīnyāsaḥ kathitaḥ*; ff. 126v6–127r1 (Ed. p. 547) *pullīramalayādiṣu pracaṇḍādaya* OṂ KARA KARA PRACAṆḌE HŪṂ HŪṂ PHAḌ *ityādimantrajā bhāvyāḥ*.

part of the passage with the words *gṛhadevateti saptamīlopāt* '[We have the form] *gṛhadevatā* [here] because zero has been substituted for the ending of the locative'.

The direction of redaction is also unmistakeable in the passage of the *Laghuśaṃvara* (1.15–4.1) (B) that prescribes the ritual of initiation. This has evidently been redacted on the basis a Śaiva source of which an expanded variant is seen in 8.3–28 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* (A) redacted in the *Jayadrathayāmala*:

A	B
8.3 *girigahvaraguhyeṣu*	1.15 *girigahvarakuñjeṣu*
mahodadhitaṭeṣu ca *ādisiddhe śmaśāne vā* *ālikhen maṇḍalaṃ śubham*	*mahodadhitaṭeṣu vā* *ādisiddhe śmaśāne ca* *tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet*
	iti herukābhidhāne *maṇḍalāvatārapaṭalaḥ prathamaḥ*
8.4 *śmaśānabhasmanā miśraṃ* *kapilāgomayaṃ śubham* *raktodakavimisreṇa* *tena bhūmiṃ pralepayet*	2.1 *tatra pānagomayena* *maṇḍalabhūmi pralepayet* *śmaśānabhasmanā yuktaṃ* *pañcāmṛtasamanvitam* 2.2 *upalipya tato bhūmiṃ* *tatra maṇḍalam ārabhet* *śmaśānaṃ tu samācaret*
8.5 *śmaśānabhasma saṃgṛhya* *śmaśāne 'ṣṭadalaṃ śubham* *śmaśānāṅgāracūrṇaṃ tu* - *trirekhaṃ maṇḍalaṃ likhet* 8.6 *ekahastaṃ dvihastaṃ vā* *caturaṣṭakaraṃ tathā* Cf. B 2.12cd *sūtrayed rudhirāktena* *śavasūtreṇa sūtradhṛk* Cf. B 2.11cd.	2.3 *cityaṅgāracūrṇena* *śmaśāneṣṭakasaṃyutam* *ālikhen maṇḍalaṃ divyaṃ* *ācāryaḥ susalakṣaṇaḥ*
	2.4 *samyagjñānatantrajñaḥ* *śrīherukamantrajñaḥ*
8.7 *akrodhano śucir dakṣo* *ācāryo jñānapāragaḥ* *kapālamālābharaṇo* *raudrabhasmāvaguṇṭhitaḥ*	*akrodhanaḥ śucir dakṣo* *yogajño jñānapāragaḥ* 2.5 *kapālakṛtamūrdhajaḥ* *bhasmānuliptāṅgaḥ*

8.8 *pañcamudrāvratadharo*	
bhairavāṅgair vibhūṣitaḥ	*saṃbhavān mātrair vibhūṣitagātraḥ*
mahābhūtāstrajālena	
samantāt pariveṣṭitam	
	mudrāmantrair alaṃkṛtam
8.9 *ālikhen maṇḍalavaraṃ*	2.11 *ālikhen maṇḍalaṃ ghoraṃ*
ghorasiddhipradāyakam	*mahāsiddhipradāyakam*
	tato mṛtakasūtreṇa
	mahārudhiraraṅjitena vā
	Cf. A 8.6cd
	2.12 *sūtrayen maṇḍalaṃ ghoraṃ*
	herukasya paraṃ puram
	ekahastaṃ catur aṣṭaṃ ca
	Cf. A 8.6ab
caturaśraṃ caturdvāraṃ	*caturasraṃ tu samantataḥ*
	2.13 *caturdvārasamākīrṇaṃ*
	catustoraṇabhūṣitam
	vicared dviguṇaṃ mantrī
	yajed ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram
madhye padmavibhūṣitam	2.14 *tasya madhye pratiṣṭhāpya*
8.10 *aṣṭapatraṃ tu tat padmaṃ*	*sapatraṃ karṇikojjvalam*
karṇikādhiṣṭhitaṃ śubham	*puṣkaraiś ca kesarānvitaṃ*
tasya madhye nyased devi	2.15 *karṇikāyāṃ nyased vīraṃ*
bhairavaṃ bhīmavikramam	*mahābhairava bhīṣaṇam*
8.11 *dakṣiṇābhimukhaṃ dīptaṃ*	*tejaskaṃ tu sudīptāṅgam*
bhīmarūpaṃ bhayāvaham	*aṭṭāṭṭahāsamahāravam*
	2.16 *kapālamālābharaṇaṃ*
	divyaṃ trinetraṃ caturmukham
	hasticarmāvaruddhaṃ ca
	vajrasaṃbhinnasabhruvam
	2.17 *khaṭvāṅgakṛtahastaṃ tu*
	śatamālārdhabhūṣitam
tasyāgrataḥ sthitā devī	*tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīṃ*
aghorā ghoravikramā	*vajravārāhīṃ sughorām*
8.12 *bhairavābhimukhāṃ kruddhāṃ*	2.18 *mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu*
raudrarūpāṃ nyaset tataḥ	*trimukhīṃ raudrarūpiṇīm*
...	...
8.19c *tataḥ śiṣyān praveśayet*	
sopavāsāñ śucīn snātān	
arcayed uttarāmukhān	
8.20 *kapālena śiraḥ spṛṣṭvā*	
saṃpuṭāṃ hṛdaye nyaset	
khaṭvāṅgena tu sarvāṅgān	
ālabhet putrakasya tu	

	3.2 *ghaṇṭānādam ālambya*
	puṣpadhūpair aluṃkṛtām
8.21 *agrato vādayed ghaṇṭāṃ*	*ghaṇṭāṃ vādayet susvarāṃ*
paṭahīṃ ḍamaruṃ tathā	*paṭahikāṃ vāpi sādhakaḥ*
	3.3 *hāhākāraṃ ca kārayet*
	evam vidhivat pūjya
	maṇḍalaṃ sarvakāmikam
vastracchannamukhaṃ devi	3.4 *saṃchādya paṭavastreṇa*
	mukhaṃ teṣāṃ tu putrakām
puṣpāñjalidharaṃ tathā	*puṣpapūrṇāñjaliṃ prakṣipet*
8.22 *pradakṣiṇīkṛtya puraṃ*	3.5 *pradakṣiṇaṃ ca tataḥ kṛtvā*
	sādhakaḥ susamāhitaḥ
	praveśayet tat puravaraṃ ramyaṃ
dakṣiṇāmūrtim āśritaḥ	*dakṣiṇāmūrtim āśritya*
tato dāvāpayet puṣpān	3.6 *puṣpāñjalin tataḥ kṣipet*
devasyopari putrakam	*maṇḍalasyopari*
8.23 *yasmiṃs tat patate puṣpaṃ*	*yasmin patati tat puṣpaṃ*
tat tasya kulam ādiśet	*kulaṃ tatra vinirdiśet*
	3.7 *śrīherukādipīṭha darśayet*
	tataḥ pūjayen mudrām
	ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ
	3.8 *śiṣyāṇān tu dvitīye ahani*
hṛnmantraparijaptena	*raktena trijaptena*
tilakān teṣu kārayet	*tilakaṃ tasya kārayet*
8.24 *raktena darśayet tasya*	*mukham udghāṭya śiṣyaṃ*
mukham udghāṭya maṇḍalam	*darśayen maṇḍalaṃ tataḥ*
yad yasya devatāsthānaṃ	3.9 *yad yasya devatāsthānaṃ*
tat sarvaṃ tasya darśayet	*tatra tāṃ darśayet samyak*
8.25 *samayāñ śrāvayitvā tu*	
praṇipatya puraṃ guroḥ	*praṇipatya tataḥ paścād*
suśrāvya pūrvavidhinā	
saṃsiddhaputrakānvitam	
8.26 *guruṃ saṃpūjya vidhivad*	3.11 *tatas tu gurave dadyāt*
vittaśāṭhyavivarjitaḥ	*tathāgatoktadakṣiṇām*
	...
	3.15c *tatas tasya tuṣyanti*
pragṛhya kulajān mantrān	
vratāṃś ca samayāṃs tathā	
8.27 *tāvad ārādhayed devi*	
yoginyo mātaro gurum	*ḍākinyo yogamātarāḥ*
	ḍākinyo lāmayaś caiva
	khaṇḍarohā tu rūpiṇī
mātṛdūtyo vratāṃś caiva	
yāvadantaṃ krameṇa tu	

8.28 *ārādhanakramād yāti*	
triṣaṣṭicaruśodhitaḥ	
bhairavībhuvanā devi	4.1 *tato ḍākinyo bhuvanāni*
	vijṛmbhayanti mahāvīryā
sarvaśaktibhir āvṛtaḥ	

Apparatus Criticus of A

Codd. : A ff. 286v2–; B ff. 182r4–; C ff. 166v3–; D ff. 200r2–; E ff. 183v7–.

8.3c *ādisiddhe śmaśāne* B : *ādisiddhai śmaśānair* ACDE **8.7a** *akrodhano* em. : *śakrodhano* Codd. **8.10d** *bhairavaṃ* em. : *bhairavī* Codd. **8.11d** *vikramā* em. : *vikramān* AC : *vikramāṃ* B : *vikramāt* DE. Cf. *Picumata* 1.2d: *aghorī bhīmavikramā* **8.19d** *uttarāmukhān* em. : *uttarāmukham* C : *uttarāṃmukham* ABDE **8.20b** *saṃpuṭāṃ* corr. : *saṃpuṭā* Codd. **8.20c** *sarvāṅgān* em. : *sarvāṅgā* ACD : *sarvāṅgo* B **8.21a** *vādayed* conj. : *vādaye* Codd. **8.21b** *paṭahīṃ* em. : *paṭaho* Codd. • *ḍamaruṃ* em. : *ḍamaras* Codd. **8.21d** *dharaṃ* em. : *varaṃ* Codd. **8.22d** *putrakam* em. : *putrakaḥ* Codd. **8.25a** *samayāñ* em. : *samayaṃ* Codd. • *śrāvayitvā* B : *śrāvayitvās* Codd. **8.25d** *saṃsiddhaputrakānvitam* conj. : *saṃsiddhaṃ putrakāṃvitam* A : *saṃsiddhaṃ putrakāṃcitam* BCDE **8.28a** *ārādhana* conj. : *aropanā* Codd. • *kramād yāti* conj. : *kramaprāpti* Codd.

Apparatus Criticus of B

Cod.: f. 2r3–. Testimonia : AbhU = *Abhidhānottara* 46.10–57 (A f. 146r6– [<*Laghuśaṃvara* 2.1–]); BhBh = Bhavabhaṭṭa ad loc.; BhK = Bhavyakīrti ad loc.; IBh = Indrabhūti ad loc.; JBh = Jayabhadra ad loc.; ŚV = Śāśvatavajra ad loc.; Tib. = *bDe mchog nyung ngu*; VV = Vīravajra ad loc.

1.15c *ādisiddhe* BhBh : *ādisiddha* Cod. **2.1a** *tatra pānagomayena* Cod. AbhU, BhBh, ŚV (*chu dang ba byung blangs* 'water and cow dung') : **tatrāpātagomayena* Tib. (*der ni lci ba ma lhung bas*), BhK (*de la lci ba ma ltung bas*) **2.1b** *pralepayet* Cod., AbhU : *upalepayet* BhBh **2.3a** *cityaṅgāra* BhBh : *cityāṅgāra* Cod. : *cityaṅgāraka* AbhU **2.3b** *saṃyutam* conj. (= AbhU); cf. *Picumata* 5.116cd: *kākaviṣṭa samādāya śmaśāneṣṭakasaṃyutam*) : *saṃyuktaṃ* Cod. **2.4a** *samyagjñānatantrajñaḥ* Cod., BhBh : *samyagjñāneṣu tattvajñaḥ* AbhU **2.4c** *akrodhanaḥ* JBh AbhU : *akrodhaś ca* Cod. BhBh **2.11d** *mahārudhirarañjitena vā* Cod., Tib. (*de nas sems med srad bu 'am | ru di ra ni chen pos brlan*) *mahārudhirāñjitena vā* BhBh : *mahārudhiraraňjitam* AbhU, Tib. **2.13d** *yajed* JBh : *japed* Cod. : *pūjayed* BhBh, Tib. (*mkha' 'gro dra ba'i bde mchog mchod*) **2.17c** *tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīṃ* JBh, BhBh, Tib. (*de mdun gnas pa'i lha mo ni*) : *tasyāliṅgatāsthitā devī* Cod. **2.18a** *mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* JBh : *mahābhairavābhimukhīṃ* AbhU, VV (*rab 'jigs byed che la phyogs*) : *śrīherukābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* Cod. BhBh : **mahāśrīherukābhimukhīṃ* Tib. (*he ru ka dpal che la phyogs*) : **śrīherukajñānābhimukha-* (*he ru ka dpal ye shes phyogs ni* IBh **3.2c** *vādayet* Cod. : *nādayet* BhBh **3.3a** *pūjya* BhBh : *sampūjya* Cod. **3.4b** *putrakāṃ* em. [Aiśa gen. pl.; =AbhU] : *putrakān* BhBh : *putrakānāṃ* Cod. **3.7a** *śrīherukādipīṭha* BhBh (*śrīherukādipīṭheti dvitīyālope*) : *śrīherukādiṃ pīṭhan* Cod. **3.7bc** *tataḥ pūjayen mudrām ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* BhBh, Tib. (*de nas slob dpon legs par ni | mnyam par bzhag ste phyag rgya mchod*): *tataḥ pūjayen mudrācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* Cod. : *tato hi pūjayet mudrām ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* AbhU : *tataḥ pūjayen mudrāṃ svamudrāṃ susamāhitaḥ* JBh **3.9a** *yad yasya* JBh, BhBh : *yo yasya* Cod., AbhU.

Here we see several tell-tale signs. In the Buddhist version the disciples undergoing the initiation are referred to as *putrakāḥ* (3.4ab: *saṃcchādya paṭavastreṇa mukhaṃ teṣāṃ tu putrakāṃ* 'Having covered the faces of those disciples with a piece of cloth'), a term that is standard in this technical sense in the Śaiva literature but to my knowledge appears with it nowhere else in Buddhist Tantric sources.

In 2.15 the installation of the main deity in the centre of the initiation Maṇḍala is described as follows: *karṇikāyāṃ nyased vīraṃ mahābhairava bhīṣaṇam* 'On the pericarp [at the centre of the lotus diagram] he should install the terrifying Vīra Mahābhairava'. The Śaiva version (8.10cd) has *tasya madhye nyased devi bhairavaṃ bhīmavikramam* 'O Devī, in the centre of that [lotus] he should install Bhairava of terrible might'. But for this parallel we might have been tempted to read the Buddhist version not as *mahābhairava bhīṣaṇaṃ*, with *mahābhairava* as a stem-form substituted for the accusative *mahābhairavaṃ* for metrical convenience, a common licence in this register of the language, but as *mahābhairavabhīṣaṇam*, preferring a pleonasm 'most frightening [and] terrible' to a reading that shows the name of the deity of the Vidyāpīṭha, a clear sign of incomplete assimilation.

The Śaiva text follows this with *tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīm aghorāṃ ghoravikramām | bhairavābhimukhīṃ kruddhāṃ raudrarūpāṃ nyaset tataḥ* 'Then he should install the goddess Aghorā of frightening might standing before him, facing Bhairava, furious and of terrible aspect'. The Buddhist version first inserts a description of some of the male deity's iconographic features and then returns to redact its Śaiva exemplar as follows: *tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīṃ vajravārāhīṃ sughorām | mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu trinetrīṃ raudrarūpiṇīm* '[and] the most frightening goddess Vajravārāhī standing before him, three-eyed, of terrible aspect, making her face Mahābhairava'. The Buddhist name of Heruka's consort has been inserted but the redactor has not troubled to do the same for Heruka, leaving the Śaiva name unchanged. The accessible Sanskrit manuscript does give the name of Heruka here, reading *śrīherukābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu*, and this reading is supported by the commentators Bhavabhaṭṭa (*śrīherukābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā*) and Indrabhūti (*he ru ka dpal ye shes phyogs ni* [**śrīherukajñānābhimukha-*]), and the Tibetan translation (*he ru ka dpal che la phyogs* [**mahāśrīherukābhimukha-*]). But it is certain that this is a later improvement, because *mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* is what we find in the older redaction attested in Jayabhadra's commentary, and in the text as incorporated in the *Abhidhānottara* (*mahābhairavābhimukhīṃ*). It is also supported by the commentary on the later form of the *Laghuśaṃvara* by Vīravajra, who gives *rab 'jigs byed che la phyogs* 'facing Mahābhairava' here.

Further, in most places where a Buddhist imprint is visible the text becomes unmetrical. This is most economically explained by the hypothesis stated above[477] that what we are seeing is a Śaiva source after its redaction by a Buddhist with little concern for metrical accuracy.[478]

Finally, the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s account of initiation is remarkably un-Buddhist in its content. This is not so much because it adheres so closely to the structure and detail of the ceremony outlined in the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, including such distinctive details as the pitching of the lines of the Maṇḍala with a cord soaked with human blood and made from the hair or sinews of a corpse (2.11), the use of such substances as the five nectars of the body (*pañcāmṛtam*) and the ash and powdered charcoal of cremation pyres on the ground of the Maṇḍala (2.1–3),[479] the beating of a drum in its worship (3.2–3), and the marking of the foreheads of the candidates with human blood (3.8).[480] It is more because the redactor has not added what from the time of the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* onwards had been the most marked characteristic of the Mantranaya's adaptation of Śaiva Maṇḍala initiation, namely the series of consecrations known as *abhiṣekaḥ*. The commentators evidently could not accept that this crucial Buddhist signature might be absent. For they have resorted to strained exegesis in order to impose it. Jayabhadra claims that the terse injunction to worship the Mudrā in 3.7 alludes to the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*, in which the Guru unites with a consort (*mudrā*) and the candidate swallows the semen. Then avoiding the difficult task of reading in allusions to any of the six consecrations that normally preceded this climactic act in his time he simply asserts that they should be done following the procedure familiar from other Tantras.[481] Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, adopts a more bold and imaginative strategy, finding all seven consecrations up to and including the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ* in 3.2–3.3a.: *ghaṇṭānādam ālambya puṣpadhūpair alaṃkṛtām | ghaṇṭāṃ vādayet susvarāṃ paṭahikām vāpi sādhakaḥ | hāhākāraṃ ca kārayet* 'Resorting to the resonance of the bell the Sādhaka should ring the bell after it has been adorned with flowers and [fumigated with] incense; or he may [beat] a drum. He should also laugh wildly'. He asks us to accept that the ringing of the bell refers to the consecration of [the giving of] the bell (*ghaṇṭābhiṣekaḥ*)[482] and, more astonishingly, that the wild laughter enjoined, literally 'the sound *hā hā*', is the consecration of [the giving of the initiatory] name (*nāmābhiṣekaḥ*).[483] Having conjured up these two consecrations he then asserts that the three that precede them are therefore implicitly intended, namely the consecration with water (*udakābhiṣekaḥ*), the consecration with the crown (*makuṭābhiṣekaḥ*), and the consecration with the Vajra (*vajrādhipatyabhiṣekaḥ*).[484] He then subjects this same passage to a second reading in order to force it to refer also to the two consecrations that follow these five: the *ācāryābhiṣekaḥ*, which qualifies the initiate to officiate as a Vajrācārya, and the consecration of the secret (*guhyābhiṣekaḥ*). He claims that in this second reading the resonance of the bell, the ringing of the bell, and the beating of the drum refer to the Guru's uniting for the purpose of the second of these consecrations with a girl of twenty-five, twelve, or sixteen respectively.[485]

---

[477] See here p. 190.

[478] See 2.4ab: *samyagjñānatantrajñaḥ śrīherukamantrajñaḥ*; 2.13d: *yajed ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*; and 3.7a: *śrīherukādipīṭha darśayet*. The reading *mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* (2.18a) probably represents a first attempt to differentiate the Buddhist version from its metrical Śaiva prototype by adding *mahā-*.

[479] This substitution of inauspicious and dangerous substances in the preparation of the Maṇḍala is a marked feature of accounts of initiation found in Vidyāpīṭha texts. See, e.g., *Picumata* f. 5v1 (3.12ab), concerning the Aghorīmaṇḍala): *asthicūrṇatadaṅgāraiḥ mantrajño ālikhet puram* 'The mantra-master should draw the Maṇḍala with powdered bone and charred bone'; f. 5v6 (3.31ab): *śmaśānotthena sūtreṇa sūtrakāryaṃ tu kārayet* 'He should do the outlining with a cord from the cremation ground'; f. 10r2–3 (3.184–185): *śmaśānotthāni bhāṇḍāni vastrasūtrādikāni tu | vastrai<r> dhvajā tu kartavyā sūtreṇa karaṇī tathā || keśair darbhā<n> yathānyāyam *acchinnāgrān* (corr. : *acchinnāgrāḥ* Cod.) *prakalpayet | veṣṭayen maṇḍālaṃ tais tu astrajaptaiḥ samantataḥ* 'The vases, cloths and cords should be made with what has come from cremation grounds. With [funeral] shrouds he should make the banners and with threads [therefrom] the pitching cord. With the hair [of corpses] he should provide the uncut-ended stems of [protective] Darbha grass. After empowering them with the weapon[-mantra] he should surround the maṇḍala with them'; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, f. 65v7 (*Rāviṇīyāgapaṭala*, [concerning the Maṇḍala of Rāviṇī in the *Kālīkula* section of the *Jayadrathayāmalatantra*], v. 101cd: *śavasūtreṇa saṃsūtrya asthicūrṇādibhir likhet* 'He should colour [the Maṇḍala] with powdered [human] bone and the like after pitching its lines with a corpse-cord'; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 200r5–6: *sūtrayed rudhiräktena *śavasūtreṇa* (corr. : *ṣavasūtreṇa* Cod.) 'He should outline the Maṇḍala with a corpse-cord smeared with blood'. The nature of this cord is indicated by Kṣemarāja on *Svacchandatantra* 13.21b: *mṛtasūtreṇa vakṣyamāṇacchummakāyuktyā mṛtasnāyunā* 'The expression 'with a corpse-thread' means 'with the sinew of a corpse' in accordance with the secret vocabulary to be taught below'. He refers here to *Svacchandatantra* 15.5: *snāyuḥ sūtraṃ prakīrtitam* 'The word cord means sinew'. This understanding is also seen in Buddhist Tantric literature. In his commentary (*-piṇḍārthaṭīkā*) on the *Hevajratantra* Vajragarbha glosses *śmaśānasūtreṇa* 'cremation ground cord' as *ro'i rgyus pa rnams kyis byas pa'i srang bus* 'a cord made from the sinews of a [human] corpse' (SNELLGROVE 1959, Pt. 1, p. 51, n.1, who mistranslates this to refer to 'a thread made from the guts of a corpse'). We also read of the use of the hair of corpses for this purpose: *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 181r4: *ālikhen maṇḍalavaraṃ tato raudreṇa bhasmanā | prathamaṃ sūtrayitvā tu śavamūrdhajarajjunā* 'He should draw the excellent Maṇḍala with human ash after first pitching its lines with a cord of corpse-hair'; *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 8.8: *narakeśasamutthena karpāsādimayena vā | sūtrayen maṇḍalaṃ divyaṃ sarvasiddhiphalodayam* 'He should trace the excellent Maṇḍala, which bestows the reward of all the Siddhis, with [a cord] made from human hair or from fibres such as cotton'. This option is no doubt fixed: cremation-ground substances for ascetics and conventional substances for householders; see, e.g., *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 2 f. 9v2 (*Vāmeśvarīyāgapaṭala*, vv. 48c–49): *vāmāmṛtādibhir lipya tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet || rajobhir *vīramārgasthaś* (em. : *vīramārgasthaiś* Cod.) **cityaṅgārādibhasmabhiḥ* (*cityaṅgārādi* conj. : *cityāṅgārādi* Cod^{ac} : *citāṅgārādi* Cod^{pc}) | *ratnādiśālijātaiś ca gṛhasthaś cālikhet tataḥ* 'Having smeared [the ground] with wine and the like he should draw the Maṇḍala upon it with powders such as the charcoal and ash of funeral pyres, if he follows the path of Heroes, and with [ground] precious stones or rice flour [etc.], if he is a housholder'.

[480] Both versions say only that this is to be done 'with blood' (*raktena*). But a variant specifying human blood (*mahāraktena*) is attested by the Tibetan translation (*mtshal chen gsum lan bzlas pa yis* [*mahāraktena trijaptena*]) and the commentators Durjayacandra (*mtshal chen lan gsum brzlas pa yis*), Vīravajra (id.), and Indrabhūti (*mtshal chen ni*).

[481] Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 114, ll. 9–11: *kulaṃ tasya vinirdiśed* (3.6) *itiparyantaṃ sukaram eva | tadanantaraṃ tantrānantaraprasiddhena vidhinā sarvam abhiṣekaṃ nivartyedānīṃ guhyābhiṣekavidhipradhānatvāt pūjayen mudrām* (3.7) *ityādinā guhyābhiṣekaṃ sūcayati* 'The text up to 'he should indicate his Family' is easy. He now alludes to the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ* with the words beginning 'he should worship the Mudrā'. He does so because this is the most important [of the consecrations]. [It is should be understood that] 'he should worship the Mudrā [i.e. the consort] after he has completed the whole consecration [process that should be performed] immediately after that [determining of the candidate's Family by casting the flower] following the procedure that is well known from other Tantras'. The expression 'the whole consecration', though singular, should be understood to refer to the whole sequence of the consecrations that precede the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*.

---

[482] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 37, l. 17: *ghaṇṭānādam ityādinā ghaṇṭābhiṣekaḥ pratipādyate* 'The passage beginning with *ghaṇṭānādam* teaches the consecration of the bell'.

[483] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* p. 38, ll. 6–7: *hāhākāraṃ ca kārayed iti | hāhākāro nāmābhiṣekaḥ | taṃ gurubhaṭṭārakenātmanaḥ kārayet* 'In the expression "He should have the *hāhākāraḥ* done", the *hāhākāraḥ* is the consecration of the name. He should have that done for himself by the venerable Guru'.

[484] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 38, l. 10: *tata udakamaulivajrādhipatyabhiṣekānāṃ grahaṇaṃ tatpūrvakatvāt tayoḥ* 'From this [reference to the consecrations of the bell and the name] it follows that the text also refers [by implication] to the consecrations of water, crown, and the Vajra Lord, because those two have to be preceded by these [three]'. The five consecrations covered here are as in *Saṃvarodaya* 18.27, where they are associated with the five Tathāgatas.

[485] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 38, ll. 13–14: *ghaṇṭānādaḥ *svaliṅgāvasthitapañcaviṃśatikādhidhānam* (em. : *svaliṅgāvasthitaḥ pañcaviṃśatikābhidhānam* Ed.) *| ghaṇṭā dvādaśābdikā | paṭahikā ṣoḍaśābdikā | ghaṇṭānādo vajrakulam | ghaṇṭā ratnakulam | paṭahikā padmakulam | hāhākāras tathāgatakulam | cakārād anyac ca | *ghaṇṭānādādīnām anyatamām ācāryaḥ sevayet* (em. : *ghaṇṭādīnām anyatamānocāsevayet* Ed.) *| ghaṇṭānādam aho sukheti mantraṃ sādhakaḥ śiṣyaḥ kārayed uccārayed ity arthaḥ | kuto 'nantaram ity āha | anāmetyādi | anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ lehayed yogavit sadā | somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnoti śāśvatīm* (1.12c–13a) *iti gātheha yojitavyā | tato 'syā idam arthāntaram | pūrvoktaprajñāsevayā yad bhūtaṃ tad anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyām ācāryaḥ śiṣyaṃ lehayet | sa ca śiṣyaḥ tataḥ somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnotīti guhyābhiṣeko 'yam* 'The resonance of the bell denotes a girl of twenty-five mounted on one's penis; the bell is a girl of twelve; and the drum is a girl of sixteen. [In addition] the resonance of the

Having made the text refer to the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*, he finds the *ācāryābhiṣekaḥ* by using the same argument that he had employed to arrive at the full sequence of the five consecrations that precede it, namely that its presence is entailed by the supposed reference to the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*, because that requires it as its antecedent.[486] He finds a reference to the final consecration that he needed to discover here, that of wisdom (*prajñābhiṣekaḥ*), in the statement in 3.7 that Jayabhadra had taken to allude to the preceding *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*: *tataḥ pūjayen mudrām ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* 'Then the Ācārya, fully concentrated, should worship the Mudrā'. If, as is highly probable, the consecration understood by Bhavabhaṭṭa here was the *prajñājñānābhiṣekaḥ* of the initiation manuals, then there would appear to a problem, because the active agent in that consecration was not the Ācārya but the candidate, who now unites with the consort himself. Bhavabhaṭṭa is very terse at this point but it is likely that he was attempting to remove this difficulty when he wrote that the text refers to the agent as Ācārya here because he is endowed with such qualities as self-control. I take him to mean that it is indeed the candidate rather than the officiant that is the agent here and that he is referred as an officiant only figuratively, because he has all the qualities that are required of an officiant.[487] These readings are, of course,

---

bell is [a women of] the Vajra Family, the bell [one of] the Jewel Family, the drum [one of] the Lotus Family, and the wild laughter [one of] the Tathāgata Family. The word 'and' [in '*and* he should laugh wildly' indicates [one of] the other [Family, that of Action]. The officiant should have intercourse with one or other of these women of whom the first is 'the resonance of the bell'. The meaning is [also] that the Sādhaka, [that is to say,] the candidate, should make, that is to say, utter, 'the resonance of the bell', that is to say, the Mantra AHO SUKHA ['Oh, Bliss']. He [also] tells us that after which [he should utter this Mantra] in the passage [of this Tantra] that begins with *anāmā-*. At this point one must read in the following verse (1.12c–13a) 'The master of Yoga should always lick [it, taking it] with the tips of his ring finger and thumb. Having relished it as though it were a draught of Soma he attains eternal success'. So there is another sense of this [verse], namely that the officiant should make the candidate take into his mouth [lit. 'lick'] the product of his sexual union with the aforesaid consort with the tips of his ring finger and thumb; and that candidate, having relished it like a draught of Soma attains Siddhi. This, then, is the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*'.

[486] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 38, ll. 23–24: *sa ca śiṣyaḥ tataḥ somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnotīti guhyābhiṣeko 'yam | ata evācāryābhiṣekaḥ siddhaḥ tatpūrvakatvāt tasya* 'This is the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*. This itself establishes the presence of the *ācāryābhiṣekaḥ*, because the former is preceded by the latter'.

[487] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 39, ll. 21–22: *tata ityādinā prajñābhiṣekaṃ darśayati | tato guhyābhiṣekānantaram | ācārya iti dhairyādiguṇayogāt* 'In the passage beginning *tataḥ* he reveals the Wisdom Consecration. The word *tataḥ* ('next') means directly after the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*. He is termed the officiant [here] because he has such qualities as self-control'. Bhavabhaṭṭa is probably alluding to the qualities of the good Ācārya as stated in vv. 8–9 of the *Gurupañcāśikā*: *dhīro vinīto matimān kṣamāvān ārjavo 'śaṭhaḥ |....*

artificial and could be imposed on the text only because Bhavabhaṭṭa, like Jayabhadra, could not accept the possibility that there might be no reference to the consecrations in a Buddhist Tantra's treatment of initiation.

Further exemplification of the direction of redaction can be seen in the first of the new parallels listed above, that on the subject of the regular rite of worshipping the Kulikā (as the *Laghuśaṃvara* has it). For ease of comparison I give in bold characters those parts of each of the three related texts, the *Picumata*, the *Herukābhyudaya*, and the *Laghuśaṃvara*, that partly or completely correspond to passages in one or both of the other two. The *Picumata* passage is as follows:

mūlasūtrādikānāṃ tu kramaṃ sādhanalakṣaṇam ||
10 ***durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu samayācārapālanaṃ*** |
yāgaṃ vidhis tathā jñānaṃ cakraṃ yogaṃ ca śobhanam ||
11 *kathayāmi mahādevi yat tvayā coditaṃ* *balam (?) |
madhyamottamacchāgena gandhodasahitena tu ||
12 ***vaṭikām prāśayet prājñaḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ*** |
vidhānan tu sadā yojyaṃ carvāhāreṇa suvrate ||
13 *samaye sādhane caiva dravyālabhanakarmaṇi* |
tasyaiva dūtayaḥ siddhāḥ sahajā *vīravandite* ||
14 *guruṇādivibhāgena sṛṣṭidravyādisaṃgrahe* |
ṛtuyogaviyogena anulomavilomajā ||
15 *yāgādhordhvagatā devi sarvakāmavilakṣaṇā* |
kuṇḍagolodbhavenaiva svayambhukusumena ca ||
16 ***japahomārcanaṃ*** *snānaṃ* ***bukapuṣpasamanvitam*** |
niyojyaṃ svena mārgeṇa svakāle yāgapūrvakam ||

f. 319v3–5

11c *madhyamottamacchāgena* em. : *adhamottamacchāgena* Cod.[488]

The related passage in the *Herukābhyudaya* is accessible only in its Tibetan translation. I give that here with a reconstruction of the Sanskrit of the parts that match the passage in the *Picumata*:

(15.6) *sngags dang phyag rgya sbyar bar bya* |
dam tshig thams cad bskyang bya ste |
'jig rten gsum na rnyed dka' ba (***durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu***) |
g.yon nas skyes pas byed pa yin |
(7) *dam tshig spyod pa'i mtshan nyid dang* (***samayācāralakṣaṇam***) |
sbyor nyid cho ga'i yi ge shes ni (***yoga eva vidhijñānam***) |
de ni nga yis bshad kyis nyon (***tan me nigaditaṃ śṛṇu***) |
dbugs dbyung mchog gi bar dag ni (***madhyamottamaśvāsena***) |
(8) *dri yi chu dang bcas pa dang* (***gandhodakasahitena [tu]***) |
rtag tu ril bu bza' par bya (***vaṭikāṃ prāśayen nityam***) |
mchod pa'i dus kyi bye brag la (***pūjākālaviśeṣataḥ***) |
pho nyas lhan cig skyes dngos grub pa (***dūtayaḥ sahajāḥ siddhā***) |
(9) *dman pa mchog dang 'bring rnams kyi* (***adhamottamamadhyamāḥ***) |
de yis sbyor bas dngos grub 'gyur (***tābhir yogena siddhiḥ syāt***) |
'dod pa'i don kun sgrub pa'o (***sarvakāmārthasādhakaḥ***) |
dpal ldan he ru ka las byung (***śrīherukodbhavam***) |
(10) *rang byung me tog nyid dag gis* (***svayambhukusumair api***) |
cho ga shes pas kun tu spyod (*vidhijñānasamācāra-*) |
bzlas dang bsam gtan mchod pa dang (***jāpadhyānapūjā***) |
me tog gcig dang yang dag ldan (***ekapuṣpasamanvitam***) |

Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba D f. 12r6–v2 (*Herukābhyudaya* 15.6–10)

TESTIMONIUM—Kumāracandra, *Katipayākṣarā nāma Herukābhyudayapañjikā*, p. 156: *evaṃ mayā* ***nigaditaṃ śṛṇu*** | ***madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ*** *pañca pradīpāḥ* | ***gandhodakaṃ*** *pañcāmṛtāni* | ***vaṭikāṃ prāśya*** (Cod. [f. 3v6] : *prāpya* Ed.) **bhāvanāgaṇamaṇḍalādau* (*bhāvanāgaṇa* corr. : *bhāvanā gaṇa* Ed.) *aūtīṃ pūjayet* | ***adhamāḥ*** *mantrajāḥ* | ***uttamāḥ*** *sahajāḥ* | ***madhyamāḥ*** *kṣetrajāḥ* | ***tābhiḥ siddhiḥ syāt*** *tasya yoginaḥ*.

The version of the *Laghuśaṃvara* reads:

1.4 *sambhavān nādarūpād viniṣkrāntāḥ samayācāragocarāḥ* |
durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu *ādimadhyāntasaṃsthitam* ||
5 *manthyamanthānasaṃyogaṃ yathā tathā mantrajāpadhyānādiyuktaṃ* |
yogaś caiva vidhijñānaṃ tantre nigaditaṃ śṛṇu ||
6 ***madhyamottamocchvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu*** |
kulikāṃ pūjayen nityaṃ kālaviśeṣeṇa tu ||
7 ***dūtayaḥ sahajāḥ siddhā adhamottamamadhyamāḥ*** |

f. 1v2–5

6a *madhyamottamocchvāsena* JAYABHADRA : *madhyamottamaśvāsena* Cod. BHAVABHAṬṬA

The *Herukābhyudaya*, then, shows a version that is closer than the

---

[488] I propose this emendation for two reasons. The first is that the reading contradicts information given later in this chapter. According to that there are three grades of flesh for use in the preparation of the sacrament (*caruḥ*): goat, cow, and human. The first is said to be inferior (*adhama-*), the second intermediate (*madhyama-*), and the third superior (*uttama-*): *adhamaṃ cchāgam ity uktaṃ madhyamaṃ gobhavaṃ bhavet | puruṣottamaṃ mahādevi tridhā tu caravaḥ smṛtāḥ* (f. 320r5–v1 [84.36c–37b]). Consequently without this emendation we have nonsense: 'with the inferior [i.e. goat], the superior [i.e. human], and goat'. With it we have a statement that is consistent with this classification: 'with the intermediate [i.e. cow], the superior [i.e. human] and [the inferior, i.e.] goat. The second reason is that the emendation has the support of the Buddhist parallels, which, as we shall see, read *madhyamottomaśvāsena* or *madhyamottamocchvāsena* here.

Laghuśaṃvara to the text of the *Picumata* in some details and covers more of it. It is particularly striking that it preserves the *Picumata*'s *vaṭikāṃ prāśayet prājñaḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ* (84.12ab), reading *rtag tu ril bu bza' par bya* | *mchod pa'i dus kyi bye brag la* 'Let him always swallow the sacramental pellet, especially at the time of worship', diverging from the *Picumata* only in having *nityam* (*rtag tu*) and *pūjākālaviśeṣataḥ* where that has *prājñaḥ* and *pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ* . That the Sanskrit read *vaṭikāṃ* is shown by the gloss *vaṭikāṃ prāśya* in the *Herukābhyudayapañjikā* (f. 3v6).

Even so it shows signs of having had difficulty in understanding some of the Śaiva proto-text's technical terms and of having dealt with this difficulty by resorting to rewriting. Thus in 15.10 *me tog gcig dang yang dag ldan* 'together with a single flower' corresponds to *bukapuṣpasamanvitam* 'together with the Buka flower' in *Picumata* 84.16, so that the Sanskrit may be restored from the Tibetan with some confidence as *ekapuṣpasamanvitam*. The context is a listing of impure ingredients to be consumed at the time of practice. Now, 'a single flower' yields no appropriate sense in this context, whereas 'Buka flower' (*bukapuṣpam*) does. For the *Picumata* tells us that in its secret vocabulary *bukam* means 'the impurity of the male organ' (84.38a: *buko liṅgamalo jñeyas*; 87.196d: *bukaṃ liṅgamalaṃ smṛtam*), and the *Kubjikāmata* tells us that *bukapuṣpam* has the same meaning (25.226ab: *bukapuṣpa kaṇākhyaṃ ca liṅgapaṅkamalaṃ tathā*). It is probable that the Buddhist redactor, failing to understand this obscure term, modified the text to produce something that had at least the appearance of sense. Kumāracandra confirms the reading *ekapuṣpa-* in his *Herukābhyudayapañjikā* and ventures to explain it as 'the blood of a [woman's] first menstruation': *ekapuṣpaṃ prathamaṃ rajaḥ vajrapadmābhyāṃ sādhyamānaṃ kapālasthaṃ* (p. 156) '[After putting it] in a skull-bowl [he should swallow] the 'one flower', i.e. the first menses, produced by the penis and vagina'. But this gloss is not only strained: it also leads the text into an implausible repetition, since the blood of first menstruation has just been mentioned in 15.10a, in the term *rang byung me tog* (= *svayambhukusumam*). He also seems not to have understood the expression *kuṇḍagolodbhava-* seen in *Picumata* 84.15c (*kuṇḍagolodbhavenaiva*), another 'secret' Vidyāpīṭha term, referring to the mingled ejaculates. He resolves his quandary by substituting the name of his deity, the Tibetan *dpal ldan he ru ka las byung* (15.9d) evidently rendering *śrīherukodbhavam*.

In the abbreviated version seen in the *Laghuśaṃvara* we have *kulikāṃ pūjayen nityaṃ* 'let him constantly worship the Kulikā' in place of the reading *vaṭikāṃ prāśayen nityam* seen in the *Herukābhyudaya* and in the Śaiva proto-text. This is evidently the result of a corruption of a redaction which read not

vaṭikāṃ but the exact synonym *gulikāṃ*;[489] and this hypothesis is confirmed by the *Abhidhānottara*, which in its own first chapter preserves *gulikāṃ* in a passage modelled on these verses of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, thus bearing witness to a stage of the redaction of this text that is earlier even than that known to our earliest commentator, since Jayabhadra accords with all later witnesses in reading *kulikāṃ* here:

> 1.7 *nādarūpād viniṣkrāntā samayācāragocaram* |
> *durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu ādimadhyāntanirmalam* ||
> 8 *manthamanthānayogena saṃyogād yatra yat tathā* |
> *prakṛtiprabhāsvaraṃ śuddhaṃ guhyapīṭhodbhavodbhavam* ||
> 9 *nirdoṣaṃ śāśvataṃ śāntaṃ khasamaṃ sṛṣṭikārakam* |
> *svabhāvaśuddham svayaṃbhūtaṃ yoginīnāṃ sukhapradam* ||
> 10 *jāpadhyānādibhir yuktaṃ yogasyaiva vidhijñatā* |
> *tantre nigaditaṃ tattvaṃ guhyakādhipate śṛṇu* ||
> 11 ***madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu*** |
> ***gulikāṃ kārayed dhīmān*** *pūjayet parṣamaṇḍalam*[490] ||
> 12 *kālavelāviśeṣeṇa pūjayet tatra dūtayaḥ* |
> *sahajāḥ siddhidāḥ sarvā adhamottamamadhyamāḥ* ||
> 13 *antargatena manasā kāmasiddhiṃ tu sādhayet* |
>
> *Abhidhānottara* A f. 2r2–6; B f. 2r4–v3
>
> 7ab *nādārūpād* em. : *nādarūpo* B : *nādarū* + A • *viniṣkrāntā samayācāragocaram* B : + + + + + + *cāragocaram* A 7d *nirmalaṃ* A : *nirmmalaḥ* B 8b *saṃyogād yatra tatra yathā* B : *sayogād yatra yat tathā* A : **yatra tatra yathā tathā* (Tib. *srub dang bsrub par yang dag sbyor* | *gang la de la ji ltar bzhin*) 8cd *prakṛtiprabhāsvaraṃ śuddhaṃ guhyapīṭhodbhavodbhavam* B : *prakṛtiprabhāsva* + + + + + + *ṭhodbhavodbhavam* A 9a *śāśvataṃ* A : *sā[illegible]naṃ* B 9c *śuddhaṃ svayaṃbhūtaṃ* conj. [= Tib. *dag pa rang byung ste*] : *śuddhasambhūtaṃ* B : *śuddham adbhūtaṃ* A 10ab *dhyānādibhir yuktaṃ yogasyaiva* B : *dhyānādibhir yu* + + + + *va* A • *jñatā* A : *jñeyā* B

The otherwise unattested *kulikāṃ* was then construed by force to mean *yoginīṃ* 'a/the Yoginī', and the verb *prāśayet* 'let him swallow', since it now made no sense, altered to *pūjayet* 'let him worship'.[491]

---

[489] For *gulikā* (variant forms: *guṭikā* and *guḍikā*) see here p. 217.

[490] The reading of 11c is further supported by the Tibetan translation: *mkhas pas dril bur byas nas ni*. Note that *dhīmān* (*mkhas pas*) here is synonymous with *prājñaḥ* found at the corresponding point in the version seen in the *Picumata* (*vaṭikāṃ prāśayet prājñaḥ*). This, then, has probably survived from the Śaiva source on which the first Buddhist version drew.

[491] Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 20: ***kulikā*** *yoginī* | *tāṃ* ***pūjayed*** *ārādhayet* | ***nityaṃ*** *sarvakālaṃ pratidinam ity arthaḥ* '[The word] *kulikā* [means] *yoginī*. It is she that he should propitiate [in this way]; and he should do so constantly, at all times, that is to say, every day'. Cf. Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 110: ***kulikām*** *iti tantre samayabhāṣā* | *vajravārāhīsvarūpāṃ bāhyāṅganāṃ* ***pūjayed***

That the Buddhist versions arose from Śaiva prototypes is clear from the detailed analysis of these and many other parallels. Other features reinforce this conclusion. In all cases the Śaiva passages fit neatly into the contexts in which they occur, without ragged edges, as it were, at their beginning and end, whereas this is often not so with the parallels in the Buddhist texts, a circumstance that fits well with a scenario in which the latter where constructed by a rather careless process of extraction, insertion, and superficial editing.

The same is suggested by the high degree of divergence between the various Buddhist commentators in their attempts to tell us what these new texts mean. They were caught out, as it were, by new materials that lacked roots in the Buddhist textual corpus in which they were trained. They did their best to make sense of what were in many cases barely intelligible passages; but without much guidance from existing Buddhist sources and with no central authority to impose consistency on their efforts they were bound to diverge.

We have a good example of this in the passage just discussed, in the words *madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu ....* The meaning of the Śaiva prototype as seen in the version of the *Picumata*, namely *madhyamottamacchāgena gandhodasahitena tu | vaṭikāṃ prāśayet prājñaḥ*, is perfectly clear to anyone who has read the whole chapter of which it is part. It means 'The wise [initiate] should swallow a pellet made from beef, human flesh, or goat mixed with scented water'.[492] The case is very different with the Buddhist versions. Their *madhyamottamaśvāsena* surely began life as a copyist's corruption; for it yields no sense in either Śaiva or Buddhist terms in the context of this rite of the pellet or, indeed, in any other. Kumāracandra, therefore, in his commentary on the passage as it appears in the *Herukābhyudaya*, could only guess at the meaning on the basis of the one part of the sentence that made undoubted sense, namely the injunction to swallow a pellet. Knowing that such pellets were made in practice from the five meats and the five body nectars he tells us that *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ* 'the intermediate and upper breath' means those meats and that the *gandhodakam* 'scented water' with which this 'breath' is to be mixed means those nectars.[493]

Jayabhadra and Bhavabhaṭṭa commenting on the same expression when it occurs in the *Laghuśaṃvara*, where the second part of the sentence has emerged through further confusion as *kulikāṃ pūjayet*, impose quite different but equally arbitrary interpretations, which are based not on the text itself but, in the absence of evident meaning, on their own notions of what the text ought to be saying here. Thus Jayabhadra, who has the variant *madhyamottamocchvāsena*, makes *madhyama-* mean 'vagina', *uttamocchvāsaḥ* 'the placing of the tongue', and *gandhodakam* 'semen', interpreting the sentence to mean that the adept should worship the Kulikā, that is to say, his female consort identified with Vajravārāhī, by placing his tongue (*uttamocchvāsena*) together with his semen (*gandhodakasahitena*) in her vagina (*madhyama-*).[494]

---

iti | yathā saṃtoṣo jāyate tathā karaṇīyam ity arthaḥ 'The word *kulikāṃ* is used in [this] Tantra following [its own special] convention. It refers to the physical woman [who is the practitioner's consort, when she is perceived as] identical with Vajravārāhī. He should worship her, which means that he should do whatever is necessary to satisfy her'. In his *Kālacakra*-influenced commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvara* (*Laghutantraṭīkā*) Vajrapāṇi interprets *kulikā* more esoterically as referring to Vajravārāhī as the non-conceptual central energy-channel: *kulikāṃ pūjayen nityam iti | iha kulikā madhyamāvadhūtī vajravārāhī nirāvaraṇā grāhyagrāhakavarjitā* (p. 59).

[492] See the footnote on my emendation *madhyamottamacchāgena* on p. 212.

[493] Kumāracandra, *Herukābhyudayapañjikā*, p. 156: *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ pañca pradīpāḥ | gandhodakaṃ pañcāmṛtāni* 'The word *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ* means the five 'lights'; and *gandhodakaṃ* means the five nectars'. On the five lights and five nectars see, e.g., Vāgīśvarakīrti, *Tattvaratnāvalokavivaraṇa* 18: *pañcapradīpaśabdena gokudahanalakṣaṇasya amṛtaśabdena vimūmāraśulakṣaṇasya satatānuṣṭhānam eva sādhyaṃ manyante* '[The learned] hold that the expression *pañcapradīpa-* refers to the accomplished regular practice of the [five meats] of the cow (*go-*), dog (*ku[kkura]-*), horse (*da[mya]-*), elephant (*ha[sti]-*), and man (*na[ra]-*), and the expression *amṛta-* to that of excrement (*vi[ṭ]-*), urine (*mū[tra]-*), flesh (*mā[ṃsa]-*), blood (*ra[kta]-*), and semen (*śu[kra]-*)'. Cf. Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 108: *ādau tāvan manonukūle sthāne niṣadya pañcāmṛtakṛtagulikāṃ mukhe kṛtvā ...* 'At the beginning [before he begins the Sādhana] he should sit in a place conducive to meditation, place a pellet of the five nectars in his mouth, ...'; Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 24: *gokudahanānāṃ pañcāmṛtasya ca vaṭikāṃ bhāvanārambhe bhakṣayet* 'At the beginning of his meditation he should swallow a pellet consisting of [the flesh of] cow, dog, horse, elephant, and man, and the five nectars'; *Sādhanamālā* 251 (Advayavajra, *Saptākṣarasādhana*), p. 490: *yogī prātar utthāya samayagulikāṃ mukhe prakṣipya ...* 'The meditator, having risen before sunrise and placed a Samaya pellet in his mouth ...'. The term *samaya-* in *samayagulikā* means the five nectars; see Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* p. 18: *samayapālanaṃ samayarakṣaṇaṃ pañcāmṛtabhakṣaṇaṃ* 'maintaining the *samaya-* means keeping the pledges [and] swallowing the five nectars'; Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 109: *samayo dvividhaḥ rakṣaṇīyo bhakṣaṇīyaś ca* 'The *samayaḥ* is of two kinds: that which is to be maintained [i.e. the post-initiatory pledges] and that which is to be swallowed [i.e. the five nectars]'.

[494] Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 110 : *madhye bhavatīti madhyamaḥ | padma ucyate | tasminn uttamocchvāso jihvāvinyāsaḥ | tena kiṃbhūtena | gandhodakasahitena tu bodhicittasahitenaivety arthaḥ | kulikām iti tantre samayabhāṣā | vajravārāhīsvarūpāṃ bāhyāṅganām pūjayed iti | yathā saṃtoṣo jāyate tathā karaṇīyam ity arthaḥ* 'The word *madhyama-*, meaning 'that which is in the centre', refers to the Lotus [i.e. the vagina]. The word *uttamocchvāsaḥ* means 'the placing of the tongue' [and *madhyamottamocchvāsena* is a locative Tatpuruṣa compound meaning 'by the placing of (his) tongue] in that. The words *gandhodakasahitena tu* 'together with the scented water' describe that [placing of his tongue in her vagina] and mean that it should be together with [his] Intention to Attain Enlightenement

In Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary we find an entirely different understanding. According to him *madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu | kulikāṃ pūjayet* means 'he should worship the Yoginī with the place or time (*-śvāsena*) of fire (*madhyama-*) and earth (*-uttama-*) together with wind (*gandha-*) and water (*udaka-*)'. The purpose of this invention, which the Sanskrit entirely fails to support, is to find a reference (1) to the symbols of the four elements as constituting the thrones of the various groups of Yoginīs in the Maṇḍala and (2) to various time periods considered to be governed by these elements as the occasions for the successful performance of rituals for hostile purposes (*abhicāraḥ*), re-invigoration (*pauṣṭikam*), expulsion (*uccāṭanam*), and the averting of danger (*śāntikam*) respectively. That Bhavabhaṭṭa has decided what he would like to find here and then imposed it is clear from the extreme artificiality of the glosses that bend the text to his will: 'the intermediate' (*madhyama-*) is fire (*vahniḥ*) because it is falls in the middle of the list of the four elements (actually in the penultimate position); the 'highest' (*-uttama-*) is that of Mahendra, the presiding deity of the symbol of earth (*pṛthivī*), because he is the king of the gods; *gandhaḥ* means not 'fragrance', its lexical meaning, but 'that which possesses fragrance', namely the wind (*vāyuḥ*), since that is the bearer of fragrance; *udaka-* is not *udakam* 'water' but an unattested *udakaḥ* meaning Varuṇa, literally 'he who possesses the waters', since Varuṇa is the presiding deity of the symbol of water (*udakam*); and *śvāsaḥ* means not 'breath' but 'that in which X breathes', that is to say, by an entirely unwarranted leap, the locus or time of X's operation.[495]

[i.e. his semen]. The word *kulikā* is a term specific to the esoteric jargon of this Tantra. It denotes the physical woman [as] identical with Vajravārāhī. By saying that one should 'worship' her the text means that one must do what is necessary to satisfy her'.

[495] Bhavabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 20: *madhyama uttamaḥ śvasity asminn aneneti vā | śvāsaḥ sthānaṃ kālo vā | madhyamo vahniḥ pṛthivyaptejovāyava iti vacanena madhyodbhavatvāt | †madhyodbhūtatve 'py upāyagrahaṇaṃ yatas tāṃ vakṣyati† | uttamo māhendro devarājatvāt | madhyamottamayoḥ śvāsaḥ sthānaṃ kālo vety arthaḥ | tena kulikāṃ pūjayed iti saṃbandhaḥ | kiṃbhūtenety āha gandhetyādi | gandho 'syāstīti gandho gandhavāhatvād vāyuḥ | udakam asyāstīty udako varuṇaḥ | tayoḥ sthānena sahito gandhodakasahita iti madhyapadalopī samāsaḥ ghṛtapūrṇo ghaṭo ghṛtaghaṭo yathā* 'The term *śvāsaḥ* is to be understood here to be derived from the root *śvas* 'to breath' in the meaning 'that in which X breathes', X in this case being *madhyamaḥ* and *uttamaḥ*. The *śvāsaḥ*, then, is the locus of these or their time-period. The *madhyamaḥ* 'intermediate' is 'fire', because it arises in the middle, in accordance with the text 'earth, water, fire, and wind'; and the *uttamaḥ* 'highest' is the [symbol] of Mahendra[, the presiding deity of the earth symbol], because he is the king of the gods. So the meaning of *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ* is 'the locus or time of the *madhyamaḥ* and the *uttamaḥ*'. With this he should worship the Kulikā. Such is the core syntax. The compound beginning *gandha-* describes this *śvāsaḥ* further as 'accompanied by *gandha-* and *udaka-*', meaning 'together with the locus of these [other] two (*gandhodakasthānasahitaḥ*). This is a compound of the type in which an intermediate word is dropped, as when one says 'a pot of ghee' (*ghṛtaghaṭaḥ*) when what one means is 'a pot full of ghee'. The other two are *gandhaḥ* and *udakaḥ*. The first is a primary derivative of *gandhaḥ* 'fragrance' in the meaning 'that which has fragrance' and refers to the wind, because that is the bearer of fragrance. The second is [likewise] a primary derivative of *udakam* 'water' in the meaning 'that which has water', i.e. Varuṇa[, the God of Water]'. The application of this explanation then follows. One is instructed to meditate on the Yoginīs one by one in a fixed order of rotation tied to the passage of time. Thus on the first Tithi of the lunar fortnight one meditates on the first eight Yoginīs during the day-time, each for one eighth of the day, the second eight during the eight half Praharas of the night, the third eight during the day of the second Tithi, the fourth eight during the night, and so on. Bhavabhaṭṭa explains there that the three eights that make up the 24 Yoginīs associated with the sacred sites must have the symbols of fire, water, and earth as their thrones (pp. 21–22: *devīnām āsanaṃ vahnimaṇḍalam iti dinabhāgaḥ; devīnām āsanaṃ vāruṇamaṇḍalam iti rātribhāgaḥ; devīnāṃ māhendramaṇḍalam āsanam iti dinabhāgaḥ*). This, evidently, is what he means by *śvāsaḥ* in the sense of 'place'. He explains its second meaning as 'time' in the following: *agnyādiyogo 'py abhicārādau tathaiva jñeyaḥ | yathābhicāre cittacakrasya vahnikṣaṇe śāntike vākcakrasya varuṇakṣaṇe pauṣṭike kāyacakrasya māhendrakṣaṇe uccāṭane śmaśānacakrasya vāyukṣaṇe yoginīnām anyatamā bhāvyā* 'This application of fire and the others should also be understood in the case of hostile rites and the like. Thus in a hostile rite one should meditate on one of the Yoginīs of the Circuit of Mind (the first eight) at a fire moment, on one of those of the Circuit of Speech (the second eight) at a Varuṇa moment in a rite to avert danger, on one of those of the Circuit of the Body (the third eight) at a Māhendra moment in a rite of re-invigoration, and on one of those of the Circuit of the Cremation Grounds (the fourth eight) at a wind moment in a rite of expulsion'.

Since these confused and barely comprehensible verses are found in the opening chapter of the *Laghuśaṃvara* the redactor has made a greater effort than usual to assimilate them to their new Buddhist milieu. But he has not done this by rewriting them in such a way that Buddhists would recognize and understand them as formulated within their own established discourse. His approach is rather that of montage or bricolage, in which bits and pieces of various texts have been clumsily combined. Instead of rewriting the verses he has sandwiched them between others derived from well-known Buddhist sources. Thus the opening verses of the work (1.1–3), which immediately precede this passage, are a version of the opening of the Buddhist *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*;[496] and the verses (1.7c–13b) that follow it contain awkwardly collocated variants of verses found in that text and the Buddhist *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* and *Guhyasamāja*.[497]

But this attempt to lend the compilation a Buddhist character by embedding the passage from the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha between verses that Buddhist Tantrics would immediately recognize as Buddhist is mostly restricted to this first section. The rest of the work up to the point at which the redaction known to Jayabhadra and Bhavyakīrti ends consists almost entirely of (1) sections for which I have found close Śaiva parallels, (2) sections for which I have not found such parallels but which are of the same type, and (3) sections devoted to giving the Mantras. These, of course, have not been lifted directly from Śaiva sources, because the Mantras so taught are peculiar to this and related Tantras. However, the Mantras themselves are Śaiva in style; and the method of teaching them by giving them letter by letter in encoded form (*mantroddhāraḥ*) has been adopted in imitation of Śaiva scriptural practice, appearing first, as we have seen, in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* that supplements the proto-Yoginītantra *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*.[498] In the light of this one readily understands why the redactor of the version known to Bhavabhaṭṭa and the other later commentators and seen in the one accessible manuscript and the Tibetan translation felt the need to add explicitly Buddhist material at the end of the work, thus accomplishing for the whole an unambiguously Buddhist frame, which in the earlier redaction had been present only in the first chapter.[499]

---

[496] See here p. 154.

[497] See here p. 163, parallels 1, 5, and 6.

CONVERTING THE OUTSIDERS. The textual dependence of these Buddhist Yoginītantras on the scriptural corpus of the Vidyāpīṭha would surely have been obvious to any learned Śākta Śaiva who examined them; and there is evidence that it was indeed noticed. We do not find this evidence in the Tantric Śaiva literature, since the only historical data that intrude there are the spiritual genealogies of its teachers. For the rest it is concerned purely with what it sees as the timeless realities of fact and injunction, and it is interested in relations between its own and other traditions only to the extent that it establishes a hierarchy among these traditions by ranking their various goals along an ascent that culminates in its own. If awareness of this textual dependence was to find expression in Śaiva literature then it could only be in the distorting mirror of mythology, where the specifics of the tensions between sects could be translated into accounts of the interaction of the gods with demons and men. Thus we find our evidence in a variant of the famous narrative of Śiva's burning of the celestial cities of the three demons (*tripuradahanam*) given in the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, a collection of Śaiva myths for the instruction of the laity compiled in the thirteenth century by the Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva Jayadratha.[500]

According to that account Bṛhaspati, the ingenious Guru of the gods, puts an end to the invincibility of these demons, the reward of their devotion to Śiva, by fooling them into abandoning the worship of that deity. He composes and introduces to them various texts for the visualization of Buddhist deities in which Śiva and other Śaiva deities are portrayed as their inferiors. Then, once they have become used to these, he adds Mantras by adapting those of the Śaiva Tantras and composes passages giving instruction in Tantric ritual procedures by cobbling together various excerpts from the same sources. Finally, he composes Buddhist treatises which supplement this Tantric corpus with reasoned arguments designed to undermine the demons' commitment to their rites and belief in God:[501]

---

[498] See here p. 154.

[499] The special character of the added, 51st chapter is indicated in the spiritual biography (*rnam thar*) of Tilopā ascribed to Marpa (Mar pa chos kyi blo gros). For there the Jñānaḍākinī and her retinue are said to have taught it to Tilopā together with the oral transmission (TORRICELLI and NAGA 1995, p. 12): *gsungs nas rtsa rgyud le'u nga gcig pa bshad rgyud dang bcas pa dang snyan rgyud gnang ngo*. The extended Tantra was already current when at least some of the Vyākhyātantras were redacted. The *Adhidhānottara* contains 50.20c–51.12b. It is possible that the text was extended first only to this point. Parts of the 50th chapter after this point are seen in the *Saṃpuṭodbhava*: 50.21–23b and 24ab > *Saṃpuṭodbhava* 5.1.16–19b; and 50.25 > *Saṃpuṭodbhava* 5.1.19cd. Verses from the remainder of the longer text, from 51.12c to the end, are found in the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* and the *Saṃvarodaya*: 51.7ab > *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 17.10ab; 51.13c–16b > *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 17.21c-24b; 51.18–19 > *Saṃvarodaya* 32.29c–30b; and 51.21d > *Saṃvarodaya* 32.31d.

[500] Jayadratha was the brother of Jayaratha, author of the *Tantrālokaviveka*, on whose date see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 418–419. That Jayadratha shared his brother's Śākta Śaiva adherence, in keeping with the family's long-established tradition, is evident throughout his work, but particularly in the opening verses of each chapter, in which he gives a metaphysical reading of the myth that follows. Thus in 13.1, introducing this narrative of the destruction of the three cities, whose point is to glorify the Kashmirian sacred site of the volcanic fire-Liṅga (*jvālāliṅgam*) at Suyam (Svayambhū) (on which see STEIN 1900, vol. 2, pp. 484–485), he equates the three cities with the cognizer, cognition, and the cognized differentiated in contracted consciousness, and the fire that destroys them with the all-inclusive nonduality whose emergence bestows liberation: *etad vedakavedyavedanamayaṃ dagdhvā purāṇāṃ trayaṃ pūrṇādvairahutāśanena śamayan māyāmayopadravam* | *jvālāliṅgatayā* **sphurañ* (A : *sphuraj* Ed.) *jagadanugrāhī svayambhūr asau devaḥ saṃprati bhāsatāṃ mama parām ullāsayan nirvṛtim* 'May that god Svayambhū blaze forth for me now, revealing the highest bliss, he who has favoured the world by manifesting himself as the fire-Liṅga after burning these three cities that are the cognizer, the cognized, and cognition, putting an end to the torment of bound existence with the fire of all-inclusive nonduality'. This is exactly in the conceptual mode of the Śākta Śaiva nondualism of Kashmir.

[501] *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 13.61–83: *ripūṇāṃ bhagavadbhaktir vijaye mūlakāraṇam* | *sā śaithilyam avāpnoti kena yatnena cintyatām* || 62 *tatrābhyupāyaḥ prāyeṇa kaścit saṃcintito mayā* | *śukrasya saṃnidhāne tu kathaṃkāraṃ pragalbhate* || 63 *teṣāṃ hitaṃ* **prāpayituṃ* (conj. : *prārthayituṃ* Codd. Ed.) *śukra eva dine dine* | *bhagavadbhaktidārḍhyāya prayatnam adhitiṣṭhati* || 64 *svayaṃ yady api* **te* (Codd. : *ye* Ed.) *bhaktās tathāpy aiśvaryagarvitāḥ* | *mitaprajñāś ca yojyante helayaiva viparyaye* || 65 *ity uktavān mahendreṇa* **pṛcchyate* (A^{pc}: *pṛcchate* Ed. A^{ac}BC) *sma sa kautukāt* | *bhagavan brūhi tāṃ yuktiṃ teṣāṃ liṅgārcanāpahām* || 66 *śrutveti so 'bravīt paśya prāyaḥ sarve 'pi sarvadā* | *uttarottaram utkarṣaṃ jñātvā rajyanti jantavaḥ* || 67 *tad īśvarād ṛte ko 'tra sarveṣāṃ mūrdhani sthitaḥ* | *svavikalpena tasyāpi kaścid ūrdhvastha ucyate* || 68 *evaṃ māyāmayaṃ teṣāṃ varṇyate svopakalpitam* | *śāstraṃ ca darśyate kiṃcil likhitvā nijayā dhiyā* ||

[Bṛhaspati:] "The root cause of the victory of our enemies is their devotion to Śiva. We must think carefully what will cause that to fade. I have already thought in general terms of a means of accomplishing that. But how[, I wonder,] will it succeed while [their Guru] Śukra is with them? For he exerts himself day after day to strengthen their devotion to the Lord in order to *secure (conj.) their welfare. [But] although they are genuinely devoted [to Śiva] they are proud of their power and of low intelligence. It should therefore be easy to lead them astray". When he had said this Indra eagerly asked him to explain the stratagem that would put an end to their worship of the Liṅga. Having heard this he replied and said: "Behold. All persons usually assign their devotion on the basis of their understanding of an ascending hierarchy. Who but Śiva is at the summit [of this hierarchy], surpassing all [others]? Nonetheless I shall use my imagination and tell [them] that there is a being above even him. In this way I shall give them false instruction of my own invention. I shall also use my wits to compose and show them some learned writing [in support of my teaching]. I shall deceitfully write visualization-texts of deities in relation to whom this Śiva will be placed in a position of inferiority, and I shall tell them that these show that there is another being who is greater even than him, so that they may give up their worship of the Liṅga and so be destroyed. However, these false teachings will have no effect while Śukra is present.

---

69 *dhyānāni devatānāṃ ca likhyante tāni kaitavāt* | *yāsāṃ maheśvaro py eṣa nyagbhāvena* **niveśyate* (Codd. : *nyaveśyate* Ed.) || 70 *evaṃ maheśvarād anya utkṛṣṭa iti kathyate* | *teṣāṃ yato bhavel liṅgapūjāśaithilyataḥ* **kṣatiḥ* (Ed. : *kṣitiḥ* A : *matiḥ* BC) || 71 *śukrasya saṃnidhāne tu prathante na kaduktayaḥ* | **sa pratītyopapattyā* (A : *sapratīpopapattyā* Ed. BC) *ca paramārthaviśāradaḥ* || 72 *ity uktavān āṅgiraso vāsavena sagauravam* | *abhyarthyate sma sā yuktir akhaṇḍā kathyatām iti* || 73 *uvāca sa tataḥ* **śakram* (A : *śukram* Ed. BC) *ākalayya bṛhaspatiḥ* | *bhavate bhagavalliṅgavaimukhye naucitī kvacit* || 74 *eṣām upaplāvayituṃ* **matiṃ* (BC : *bhaktim* A : *satyam* Ed.) *eṣa mama kramaḥ* | *buddher āgatam ity etad darśanaṃ bauddham ucyate* || 75 *buddhaḥ prasiddhas tatraikaḥ* **saṃkalpyeta* (Codd. : *saṃkalpeta* Ed.) **sureśvaraḥ* (Ed. AC : *sureśvara* B) | *dhyāne yacchatradhartṛtve likhyante kāraṇāny api* || 76 *gaṇapatyādayo ye ca śaivā atyuttamāḥ sthitāḥ* | *teṣāṃ mūrdhani likhyante devā bauddhā* **amī iti* (Codd. : *amīti ca* Ed.) || 77 *mithyopakalpitāny evaṃ dhyānāny ālokya dānavāḥ* | *śivād utkarṣavanto 'mī iti* **muhyanty asaṃśayam* (AB Ed. : *muhyanti saṃśayam* C). 78 *evaṃ dhyāneṣu siddheṣu prasiddhiṃ* **lambhiteṣu* (A Ed. : *lambiteṣu* BC) *ca* | *śaivatantrānuvādena mantrān api niyojaye* || 79 *uddhṛtya śivaśāstrebhyaḥ khaṇḍān khaṇḍān niyojaye* | *mantratantrādikaṃ kṛtyaṃ yat kiṃcic copakalpitam* || 80 *bandhamokṣavyavasthāyāṃ śāstraṃ yac ca viracyate* | *tatra* **tīvrataraḥ prajñāprakarṣaḥ* (*tīvrataraḥ* Codd. : *tīvratara* Ed.) **pariposakaḥ* (Codd. : *paritoṣakaḥ* Ed.) || 81 *liṅgārcanādikas tatra bandhas tāvan nigadyate* | *muktis tu śūnyataiva syād itikartavyahāriṇī* || 82 *yajñādikā kriyā* **yeyaṃ* (A : *seyaṃ* Ed. BC) *sā tatra pratihanyate* | *ātmā nāstīti saṃcintya dūṣyate parameśvaraḥ* || 83 *evaṃvidhaṃ mayā śāstraṃ viracayya puraṃdara* | *hṛdi* **praveśya* (conj. : *praviśya* Codd. Ed.) *bhagavadbhaktis teṣāṃ vihanyate* || 84 **śukrasyāsaṃnidhānaṃ* (Codd. : *śukrasya saṃnidhānaṃ* Ed.) *tu tatra siddhyai* **pratīkṣyate* (Codd. : *pratīkṣate* Ed.).

[For] he, through intuition and reason, is fully conversant with ultimate reality". Thus said the Atharvavedic priest [of the gods]. Then Indra respectfully asked him to explain the stratagem more fully. After some reflection Bṛhaspati said to Indra: "It is entirely inappropriate that it should be you that has to divert [these demons] from the worship of Śiva's Liṅga. [So I shall take on this task myself.] My way of destroying their understanding will be this. I shall call this teaching Buddhist, [appropriately enough] since it will be born of [nothing more than] my intellect (*buddhiḥ*). The well-known Buddha will be conceived therein as the sole lord of the gods. Even the greatest deities will be portrayed as his chowry-bearers. Gods that I shall call Buddhist will be depicted positioned on top of Gaṇapati and others of the highest Śaiva deities. When the demons see these falsely conceived visualization-texts they will certainly make the mistake of thinking that these gods are greater than Śiva. Once these texts have been established and I have accustomed the demons to them I shall introduce Mantras modelled on [those of] the Śaiva Tantras (*śaivatantrānuvādena*) and by redacting various passages from these same scriptures (*uddhṛtya śivaśāstrebhyaḥ khaṇḍān khaṇḍān*) I shall add a worthless, concocted system of [Tantric] observances involving Mantras, ritual, and the rest. The learned [Buddhist] literature that I shall compose to define bondage and liberation will be nourished by higher reasoning of an exceptional degree of rigour. It will explain, of course, that of these two bondage includes such activities as worshipping the Liṅga; and liberation will be [defined as] a voidness [of self] that [once accepted] will subvert [their commitment to their] religious duties. Their sacrifices and other rituals will be opposed there; and coming to believe [though this teaching] that there is no soul they will denigrate Śiva himself [for teaching otherwise]. Indra, when I have composed learned teachings of this kind I shall insinuate them into their hearts and so put an end to their devotion to Śiva. For the plan to succeed we have only to wait until Śukra is absent".

Bṛhaspati's plan works. The demons' Śaiva Guru leaves for a year to attend a sacrifice. Bṛhaspati takes on his appearance and thus disguised sets about converting them to Tantric Buddhism. They become so anti-Śaiva that they can no longer bear even to mention the Śivaliṅga, let alone worship it,[502] thus making it possible for Śiva to destroy them.

Evidently the Buddhist Tantric scriptures that Bṛhaspati is represented here as having concocted are the Yoginītantras as typified by the *Laghuśaṃvara* and its satellites;[503] and the fact that this understanding of the nature of the genesis of these texts appears in a work of this kind suggests that it was common knowledge. For the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, being concerned with the cults of Śiva at sacred sites, is not addressed to the narrow community of the initiated but to the widest possible audience for a Śaiva text in Sanskrit, that is to say, the uninitiated Śaiva laity. Nor can this text be seen in spite of this as reflecting the knowledge of a learned minority at the time of its composition. For between the opening and closing verses of each chapter the text is written in a rather unpolished style that is so similar to that of the anonymous Purāṇic tracts in praise of sacred sites that it should not be seen as a composition in the full sense of that term but rather as a compilation in which Jayadratha has lightly edited pre-existent materials of this popular genre.[504]

---

[502] *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 13.127c–128b: **tataḥprabhṛti* (A : *tadāprabhṛti* Ed. B) *te daityāḥ śivabhaktiparāṅmukhāḥ* | *asahanta na liṅgasya nāmāpi kim utārcanam*.

[503] That this is the Buddhism envisaged here is in keeping with another anti-Buddhist myth in this collection (*Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, chapter 17 and SANDERSON 1995b, p. 94 for a summary). For there the adherents of Buddhism are said to be led by three demons: Heruka, Śaṃvara (the two Vajraḍākas), and Ādibuddha (Kālacakra).

The redactional relation between the Yoginītantras and Śaiva Tantras of the Vidyāpīṭha may not, of course, have been so obvious to learned Buddhists once these texts had been propagated and the work of commentary undertaken, let

---

17.4: *māyāśambariko nāmnā herukākhyaś ca dāruṇaḥ | ādibuddhābhidhānaś cety asurās traya āsate*; 17.9: *vajraḍākāv iti khyātau tadā herukaśambarau | ādibuddhena sahitau surāṇāṃ cakratur bhayam*. Heruka here is evidently Hevajra, since he is described as eight-headed, four-legged, sixteen-armed, and embraced by Nairātmyā (17.5). He leads the Buddhists in their war against the gods. He is surrounded by an army of Mādhyamikas (*madhyamanāmānaḥ*), followers of the Mantranaya (*mantranayātmakāḥ*), *bhramamohātmakāḥ*, *mithyājñānātmakāḥ*, Śrāvakas (*śrāvakātmānaḥ*), and Buddhas copulating with their consorts (17.7–8). The meaning of the terms *bhramamohātmakāḥ* and *mithyājñānātmakāḥ* is not immediately obvious. Since it is clear from the context that they refer to distinct groups among the Buddhists (*bhramamohātmakāḥ kecin mithyājñānātmakāḥ pare*) I take them to mean 'those who are devoted to the delusion of [the objective existence of] non-objective cognitions') and 'those who are devoted to the view that [belief in this reality of] cognitions [containing the appearance of their objects] is false', understanding these expressions to refer to the two kinds of Yogācāras, those who hold mind-only with form and mind-only without form respectively to be ultimately real, that is to say Sākāravijñānavādins and Nirākāravijñānavādins. Classifying Mahāyāna Buddhists into Mādhyamikas and these two kinds of Yogācāras and the classification of all these into those who follow the Mantranaya and those who do not, that is to say, those who follow the non-Tantric Pāramitānaya, is a commonplace in the doxographical tradition of late Indian Buddhism; see, e.g., Advayavajra, *Tattvaratnāvalī*, pp. 4–8; Sahajavajra, *Sthitisamāsa* ff. 4v1–6r2 (*nirākārayogācārasthitisamāsaḥ*), ff. 6r2–7r1 (*sākārayogācārasthitisamāsaḥ*), ff. 7r1–11r3 (*madhyamāsthitisamāsaḥ*), and ff. 11r3–18v5 (Mantranaya); Vāgīśvarakīrti, *Tattvaratnāvalokavivaraṇa*, pp. 141–142 (*mantranaye ca vijñānavādamadhyamakamatayor eva pradhānatvāt ...*); Mokṣākaragupta, *Tarkabhāṣā*, pp. 107–110; and KAJIYAMA 1998, pp. 148–151, 154–158.

[504] Consider Jayadratha's own statement at the beginning of the work (1.5): *deśe śrīvijayeśasya nivasan preraṇāt tayoḥ | caritrāṇi trinetrasya śāstradṛṣṭāni gumphaye* 'While living in the land of Śiva Vijayeśvara I shall string together the deeds of the Three-Eyed [God] as I have seen them in the sacred texts, at the instigation of these two [teachers]'.

alone to the ordinary lay devotee of the Buddha. But the iconographical repertoire, the retinue types, the style of worship and Kāpālika observance, and the growing autonomy and diversification of the goddess, are so closely parallel to what we see among the Śākta Śaivas that it is hard to believe that any Indian, learned or not, could have seen these deities and observed the practices of those that propitiated them without being aware of this fact.

This must have been especially so in east India. For the Śākta tradition was particularly strong there, as it still is, and had deep roots in the domain of popular religion, as is evident from such Purāṇas of the region as the *Devīpurāṇa*, *Bṛhannāradīyapurāṇa*, *Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa*, and *Kālikāpurāṇa*,[505] from non-eastern testimony,[506] from the fact that east-Indian locations are conspicuous in early lists of the Śākta sacred sites,[507] and from the inscriptions and other historical records of this period. Thus when Devapāla is eulogized in an inscription of his son Mahendrapāla it is for two achievements: his martial success and, as we have seen, his building of two exceptional temples, one of the Buddha and the other of the Śaiva Goddess; Śākta Śaiva deities figure strongly, as we have seen, in the various pious works of Nayapāla detailed in the Siyān inscription: several Vaḍabhī temples for goddesses, one of them for a hill-top Carcikā installed by his predecessor Mahendrapāla, temples for the Nine Durgās, and temples for the [Bhairava] Hetukeśvara and a Bhairava accompanied by a retinue of sixty-four Mothers;[508] and Madanapāla, the patron of Saṃdhyākaranandin, is described in that poet's *Rāmacarita* as having attained his success in war through the favour of Caṇḍī.[509] Even the Saiddhāntika Praśasti from Bāṅgarh has a Śākta context, its immediate purpose being to report the building by the Rājaguru Mūrtiśiva of a Vaḍabhī temple for Carcikā.[510]

---

[505] See CHAKRABARTI 2001 *passim*. The *Devīpurāṇa* (39.143–145) lists places where the Mother goddesses are especially present. In this list are Varendra, Rāḍhā, and Kāmarūpa: *veśyāsu gopabālāsu tuḍahūṇakhaseṣu ca | pīṭhe himavataś *cālpa* (?) **jālandhare* (corr. : *jālandhara* Ed.) *savaidiśe || *mahodare* (?) *varendre ca rāḍhāyāṃ kośale pure | bhoṭṭadeśe sakāmākhye *kiṣkindhe* (corr. : *kiṣkindhye*) *ca nagottame || malaye *kollanāme* (conj. : *kolunāme* Ed.) *ca kāñcyāṃ ca hastināpure | ujjayinyāṃ ca tā vidyā viśeṣeṇa vyavasthitāḥ* 'Those Vidyās are especially present among courtesans, cowherd girls, *Tūḍas (?), Hūṇas, and Khasas, in the sacred site of Himālaya* ...(?), in Jālandhara, Vidiśā, *Mahodara (?), Varendra, Rāḍhā, the capital of Kosala, Tibet, Kāmarūpa, the great mountain of Kiṣkindhā, Malaya, *Kolla[giri] (conj.), Kāñcī, Hastināpura, and Ujjayinī'.

[506] A verse in a Purāṇic passage on the calendrical festivals of Kashmir cited by Lakṣmīdhara early in the twelfth century in the *Nīyatakālakāṇḍa* of his *Kṛtyakalpataru* (p. 410, ll. 4–5) associates the sanguinary cult of Durgā/Bhadrakālī with the peoples of Bengal and Orissa (Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga), the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas: *evaṃ nānāmlecchagaṇaiḥ pūjyate sarvadasyubhiḥ | aṅgavaṅgakaliṅgaiś ca kiṃnarair barbaraiḥ śakaiḥ* 'She is worshipped in this way by various foreign communities, by all the Dasyus: the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga, the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas'. In this list only the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga and the Iranian Śakas (if this reading is sound) are well-known. As for the Kinnaras and Barbaras, Varāhamihira locates the former, under the synonym Aśvavadana, in the east (*Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 14.6ab: *khasamagadhaśibiragirimithilasamataṭoḍrāśvavadanadanturakāḥ*), and the latter in the south-west (14.18c).

[507] See SANDERSON 2001, p. 7, fn. 4. This is particularly clear in the case of the eight principal sites among the twenty-four: the eight Kṣetras, namely Aṭṭahāsa, Caritra, Kolāgiri, Jayantī, Ujjayinī, Prayāga, Varaṇā/Vārāṇasī, and Koṭivarṣa (see here p. 195), or, in a variant, Prayāga, Varaṇā/Vārāṇasī, Kollagiri, Aṭṭahāsa, Jayantī, Caritra, Ekāmra, and Devīkoṭa (see, e.g., citation of the *Mādhavakula* in *Tantrālokaviveka* on 29.67; *Kularatnoddyota* f. 13r3–4: *prayāgā varuṇā kollā aṭṭahāsā jayantikā | caritraikāmrakaṃ caiva *devikoṭṭaṃ* [corr. : *devikoṣṭhaṃ* Cod.] *tathāṣṭamam*). Aṭṭahāsa, Koṭivarṣa/Devīkoṭa, Caritra, and Ekāmra are all in eastern India, the first two in Bengal and the last two in Orissa. The location of Jayantī is uncertain. It too is east-Indian if it is the Jayantīpura in the Ganjam District of Orissa rather than that in Karṇāṭaka (Banavasi). Other east-Indian sites among the twenty-four are Viraja (Jajpur in Orissa), Nagara (Pāṭaliputra, in

> [Mūrtiśiva], being devoted to pious works, has constructed this Vaḍabhī temple which seems to embody his two halves miraculously transformed in a mountain of snow and a mountain of gold. I fancy that Indra's elephant, now that he can see the wondrous reflection of the lions [on its roof] in the waters of the heavenly Ganges, will recoil [in fear] and no longer drink its waters.

That the temple is described as a Vaḍabhī surmounted by lions establishes that it is a temple of a goddess.[511] The inscription does not state explicitly that this goddess is a Carcikā: it did not need to do so since the inscription was not doubt *in situ*. But we can infer that she was from the fact that the inscription begins with obeisance to her followed by two benedictory verses in her praise:[512]

Bihar), and Puṇḍravardhana (in Bengal) among the eight Saṃdohas or Upakṣetras (*Niśisaṃcāra* f. 15v1 [3.26]; *Kubjikāmata* 22.32–38), and Pṛṣṭhāpura (Piṣṭāpura in Kaliṅga, in the East Godavari District of Andhra Pradesh), and Rājagṛha (in Bihar) among the eight Upakṣetras or Saṃdohas (*Niśisaṃcāra* f. 15v3–4 [3.29]; *Kubjikāmata* 39–46). We see the same emphasis on the east of India in the scheme of nine sacred sites (three Pīṭhas, three, Upapīṭhas, and three Saṃdohas) taught in the *Niśisaṃcāra*. In the version of that text known to Abhinavagupta and his commentator Jayaratha the three Pīṭhas are Kāmarūpa (Assam), Pūrṇagiri (in the Deccan), and Uḍḍiyāna (Swat). The Upapīṭhas and Saṃdohas are Puṇḍravardhana, Vārendra, Ekāmra, Devīkoṭa (all four in eastern India), Ujjayinī, and Kollagiri; see *Tantrāloka* 15.83c–88.

[508] For Nayapāla's foundations see here pp. 111–114.

[509] Saṃdhyākaranandin, *Rāmacarita* 4.21: *caṇḍīcaraṇasarojaprasādasampannavigrahaśrīkam | na khalu madanaṃ sāṅgeśam īśam agāj jagadvijayaśrīḥ* 'Did not the glory of world-conquest come to King Madana when, with the king of Aṅga, he had achieved success in battle by the favour of the lotus-like feet of Caṇḍī?'

[510] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 25: *teneyaṃ himakāñcanācalamahākautūhalāveśitasvīyārdhārdhavapuṣmatīva vaḍabhī puṇyātmanā nirmitā | yatsiṃhapratibimvam ambaradhunītoyeṣu manye 'dbhutaṃ dṛṣṭvā saṃkucadaṅghrir adya na jalāny airāvataḥ *pāsyati* (em. : *paśyati* Ep.).

[511] See here p. 112.

[512] *om namaś carcikāyai || surāsuraśiraḥśreṇipaṭavāsasamā jagat | pāntu viśvakṛtābhyarcāś carcācaraṇareṇavaḥ || daṃṣṭrāsaṃdhinilīnam ekakavalam viśvaṃ tad aśnāmi kiṃ saptāmbhodhijalāni hastasuṣire guptāni kim pīyate | ity āhāradaridratākulatayā śuṣyattanum bibhratī kalpānte nṛkapālamaṇḍanavidhiḥ pāyāj jagac carcikā.*

> Obeisance to Carcikā.
>
> May the world be protected by the dust from the feet of Carcikā, worshipped by the creator of the universe, fragrant powder for the heads of all the gods and demons.
>
> May Carcikā protect the world, who at the aeon's end, garlanded with human skulls, with her body becoming desiccated out of anxiety at the poverty of her fare, thinks: "What shall I eat? If I devour this universe in a single bite, it will be no more than a fragment that will lodge between my teeth. What shall I drink? The water of [all] the seven oceans is insufficient to be visible in the hollow of my palm.[513]

That a Saiddhāntika Guru should have built a temple for a fearsome goddess of this kind is compelling evidence of the strength of Śāktism in the Pāla realm. For there is nothing in the Siddhānta itself to prompt such a construction, that tradition generally marking itself off from the cults of such deities with their gruesome iconography and their ecstatic and transgressive rites.

Indeed, as this anomalous foundation suggests, the cult of the emaciated Carcikā seems to have been particularly well-established in the region. There are numerous surviving images of this goddess at or from sites in Bihar, West Bengal, Bangladesh, and Orissa, dating from the ninth century to the fourteenth;[514] she figures prominently in the east-Indian Śākta *Devīpurāṇa*;[515] and in early canonical treatments of the Śākta Śaiva sacred sites this goddess is said to preside at Devīkoṭa,[516] Puṇḍravardhana,[517] both in Varendrī, and Ekāmra (Bhubaneswar) in Orissa.[518] In the first she has the name Karṇamoṭī,[519] according to the *Niśisaṃcāra*, *Picumata*, and *Kubjikāmata*, and Bahumāṃsā according to the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa*.[520] In the other two she is called Cāmuṇḍā.

---

[513] With these verses compare those of the east-Indian poets Bhāsoka and Umāpatidhara in the anthology *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (vv. 126 and 129), compiled by the east-Indian Śrīdharadāsa in 1205 under Lakṣmaṇasena. Bhāsoka's being east-Indian is evident from his name in -oka; see the many names of this kind in the east-Indian anthologies *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, and *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, Amṛtoka, Saṅgokā, Ucchoka in the inscriptions of Bengal (N.G. MAJUMDAR 2003, pp. 179, 27, 37, 178), and Dibboka and Rudoka in the commentary on *Rāmacarita* 1.39. Umāpatidhara composed the Deopārā inscription of the Sena king Vijayasena (r. c. 1096–1159) and is reported in Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* to have been a minister of the Sena Lakṣmaṇasena (r. c. 1179–1206); see N.G. MAJUMDAR 2003, p. 45.

[514] See Camunda (Cāmuṇḍā) in the *Huntington Archive*. For Orissa see also DONALDSON 1991.

[515] See in particular *Devīpurāṇa*, Patalas 7 and 9 (> *Agnipurāṇa* 135) on Cāmuṇḍā's Padamālāmantra. In that Mantra Cāmuṇḍā is described as having her body clothed with an elephant hide (*gajacarmaprāvṛtaśarīre*). This feature, which was borrowed from the iconography of Śiva not only by Cāmuṇḍā but also, as we have seen, by Cakrasaṃvara and Vajravārāhī, is found in most of her east-Indian images. See *Huntington Archive*, Scans 0058416 (Bangladesh), 0006042 (Itahar, North Dinajpur District, West Bengal), 0013693 (findspot not recorded), 0013697 (findspot not recorded), 0002686 (Harsinghpur, Darbhanga, Bihar), 0000308 (West Bengal),

---

0013061 (Dighapatiya, Natore District, Bangladesh), 0002607 (Munger [Monghyr], Bihar), 0013063 (Bangladesh), 0013062 (Mahātore, Dinajpur District), and 0013476 (Vikramapura, Dacca District, Bangladesh); also *AIISPL* Acc. no. 32782 (Advahati, Burdwan, West Bengal). It is not generally seen in images of Cāmuṇḍā from other regions. An exception is a fine sculpture at Khajuraho (*AIISPL* Acc. no. 45199) from the Chandella period (*c.* 900–1150). It is perhaps to be introduced by emendation into the description of Cāmuṇḍā's icon in *Agnipurāṇa* 50.21c–23b: *cāmuṇḍā koṭarakṣī syān nirmāṃsā tu trilocanā* ‖ *nirmāṃsā asthisārā vā ūrdhvakeśī kṛśodarī* | ***dvipacarmadharā** (*dvipa* conj. : *dvīpi* Ed.) *vāme kapālaṃ paṭṭiśaṃ kare* ‖ *śūlaṃ kartrī dakṣiṇe 'syāḥ śavārūḍhāsthibhūṣaṇā*.

[516] See here p. 112.

[517] *Niśisaṃcāra* f. 18v2–3 (4.35–36): ***cāmuṇḍeti ca *vikhyātā*** (em. : *vikhyā* Cod.) *devyā vā* ***puṇḍravardhane** (corr. : *puṇḍa* Cod.) | *mahābalākulotpannā khaṭvāṅgakaraśobhitā* ‖ 36 *bhuktimuktikarā devyā saṃdohakṣetrasaṃsthitā* | *kumbhākhyo kṣetrapālaś ca tasmin kṣetre vyavasthitaḥ*; *Kālīkulakramārcana* f. 21v1: HRĪṂ ŚRĪṂ ŚRĪ*PUṆḌRAVARDHANAMAHOPAKṢETRE CĀMUṆḌĀ-AMBĀPĀDA (*puṇḍra* corr. : *pūṇḍa* Cod.).

[518] *Niśisaṃcāra* f. 31r1–2: ***ekāmre** (em. : *ekātye* Cod.) **saṃsthito* (corr. : *saṃsthitā* Cod.) *devi kīrti*vāseti* (corr. : *tāseti* Cod.) **kīrtitaḥ* (corr. : *kīrtitā* Cod.) | ***cāmuṇḍayā*** (corr. : *cāmuṇḍāyā* Cod.) *samāyu*ktaḥ* (corr. : *ktaṃ* Cod.) *sthānabalisamanvi*tam* (corr. : *taḥ* Cod.); *Kubjikāmata* 15.28–30: *vartamānikakalpe tu* ***ekāmrakavanāntagāḥ*** | *kapālīśa*kuleśānacāmuṇḍācakramadhyagāḥ* (*kuleśāna* corr. : *kuleśānaṃ* Ed.) ‖ 29 *śrīkuleśvaradevasya hṛtpadme 'ṣṭadale sthitāḥ* | *īśānakramayogena sṛṣṭimārgāvalambikāḥ* ‖ 30 *karṇikāyāṃ sthito devaś catuṣkaparivāritaḥ* | *raktākarālācaṇḍākṣīmahocchuṣmāsamanvitaḥ*; *Kularatnoddyota* f. 16r2 (3.140c–142b): ***ekāmrakavanāntasthā*** *utpannā<ḥ> parameśvari* ‖ 141 *kapālīśasamopetāś* ***cāmuṇḍā*cakramadhyagāḥ*** (corr. : *ścakra* Cod.) | *pīṭhasthānāśrayodbhūtāś catasro 'nyā<ḥ> parāmbike* | 142 *raktā karālā caṇḍākṣī ucchuṣmeti prakīrtitāḥ*.

[519] Karṇamoṭī is listed as a synonym of Cāmuṇḍā in *Amarakośa* 1.1.92 (see here p. 231). The name appears for Cāmuṇḍā in the series of eight Mother goddesses when these are given as the deities of the seven sets of sounds of the Sanskrit syllabary plus KṢA in *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 16.41c–43c: *kavarge saṃsthitā brāhmī cavarge caiva vaiṣṇavī* ‖ *māheśvarī ṭavargasthā yāmyā pūjyā ta-m-ādinā* | *kaumārī sarpavalayā pādyenaitāṃ prapūjayet* ‖ *yavarge vāsavī tatra karṇamoṭī śa-m-ādinā* | *krodhe *jñeyā* (conj. : *seyā* Ed.) *parā śaktir aghoreśī* 'Brāhmī is in the gutturals, Vaiṣṇavī in the palatals, Māheśvarī in the retroflexes, and Yāmyā in the dentals. He should worship snake-bangled Kaumārī with the labials. Aindrī is in the semivowels and Karṇamoṭī (= Cāmuṇḍā) in the sibilants. Know that the goddess in *kṣa* is the supreme Power Aghoreśvarī'. The origin of the name is unknown, the common interpretation 'Ear-pearl' being implausible since it fails to account for the retroflex *ṭ*.

[520] *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.109, 112, 124 This name is probably an epithet that served as this Karṇamoṭī's personal name and so does not indicate a different goddess. The epithet, meaning 'having much meat', no doubt refers to her insa-

Of these sites Devīkoṭa appears to have been of special importance from early times. The *Mādhavakula* refers to it simply as Śrīpīṭha, that is to say, as *the* Seat [of the Goddess];[521] and the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* describes it[522] as a city originally fashioned by Brahmā where this goddess and the other Mothers who accompany her were created by Śiva and the other gods from their own bodies in order to destroy the demons who had seized it. After the city has been freed Śiva declares that henceforth it will be the Mothers' sacred abode,[523] that he will reside here with them as Hetukeśvara,[524] and that they will be worshipped following ritual procedures taught in Tantras that will be composed for this purpose by the grateful gods. The titles of these Tantras of the Mothers (*mātṛtantrāṇi*), which are listed in the narrative, reveal them to be Yāmalatantras, headed by the *Brahmayāmala*.[525]

---

tiable appetite for animal sacrifices. The alternative, that it means 'fleshy', that is to say, full-bodied, is highly implausible, since she is described here as the destroyer of the universe and as having a hideous form (171.108c–109: *tato devo 'sṛjad devīṃ rudrāṇīṃ mātaraṃ śubhām* | *vikṛtaṃ rūpam āsthāya dvitīyām api mātaram* | *nāmnā tu bahumāṃsāṃ tāṃ jagatsaṃhārarūpiṇīm* 'Then the deity [Śiva] emanated the fine Mother goddess Rudrāṇī, and, taking on a hideous form, a second Mother, the [well-known goddess] called Bahumāṃsā, who embodies the destruction of the universe'.

[521] See here p. 192 and *Tantrāloka* 29.60cd.

[522] *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.78–137, referring to Devīkoṭa under its name Koṭivarṣa. See here p. 113.

[523] *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.120c–121b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: *bhavatīnām idaṃ sthānaṃ koṭīvarṣam iti śrutam* | *bhaviṣyati jagatkhyātaṃ sarvapāpapramocanam* 'This place known as Koṭīvarṣa will be yours, famed throughout the world, with the power to free from any sin'; 171.133cd: *koṭīvarṣam idaṃ sthānaṃ mātṝṇāṃ priyam uttamam*.

[524] *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.121c–122b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: *ahaṃ hetur hi yuṣmākaṃ yasmāt sṛṣṭā mayaiva ca* ‖ *herukeśvaranāmnāhaṃ sthāsyāmy atra varapradaḥ* | *yuṣmābhiḥ saha vatsyāmi nāyakatve vyavasthitaḥ* ‖ *yas tu yuṣmān mayā sārdhaṃ vidhivat pūjayiṣyati* | *sarvapāpavimuktātmā sa parāṃ gatim āpsyati* 'Because I am your cause (*hetuḥ*) and it was I that created [you], I shall be present here to bestow boons with the name Hetukeśvara. I shall dwell here with you as your leader. Whoever correctly worships you with me will be freed from all sins and attain the highest goal'.

[525] *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.127–132b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: *ahaṃ brahmā ca viṣṇuś ca ṛṣayaś ca tapodhanāḥ* | *mātṛtantrāṇi divyāni mātṛyajñavidhiṃ *prati* (conj. : *param* Cod.) ‖ 128 *puṇyāni prakariṣyāmo yajanaṃ yair avāpsyatha* | *brāhmaṃ svāyambhuvaṃ caiva kaumāraṃ yāmalaṃ tathā* ‖ 129 *sārasvataṃ ca gāndhāram aiśānaṃ nandiyāmalam* | *tantrāṇy etāni yuṣmākaṃ tathānyāny sahasraśaḥ* ‖ 130 *bhaviṣyanti narā yais tu yuṣmān yakṣyanti bhaktitaḥ* | *narāṇāṃ yajamānānāṃ varān yūyaṃ pradāsyatha* ‖ 131 *divyasiddhipradā devyo divyayogā bhaviṣyatha* | *yāś ca nāryaḥ sadā yuṣmān yakṣyante sarahasyataḥ* ‖ 132 *yogeśvaryo bhaviṣyanti rāmā divyaparākramāḥ* 'I, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and the ascetic sages will compose excellent and holy Mātṛtantras for the rites of the worship of the Mothers, by means of which you shall receive offerings. The *Brah-*

Moreover, it is probable that some at least of the surviving east-Indian images of the emaciated goddess reproduce the iconography of this important local form. An image of Carcikā from the Dinajpur District of Bangladesh, in which Devīkoṭa was located, shows the goddess seated beneath a banyan tree;[526] and we see the same in an image from an unrecorded site in West Bengal.[527] In both images severed human heads are attached by their hair to the tree's branches, indicating that the site of this tree is a cremation ground, since cremation grounds were also places of execution.[528] Now, in the tradition of the *Picumata* and the *Niśisaṃcāra* each of the major Śākta sites is a cremation ground with its own distinctive sacred tree; and in the case of Koṭivarṣa/Devīkoṭa this is indeed the banyan (*vaṭavṛkṣaḥ*).[529] This strongly suggests that the local Carcikā of Devīkoṭa may have been multiplied in the manner of the Naṭarāja of the Tamil country, which though originally the deity of Cidambaram was established in secondary forms in temples throughout the region. We may note also that most of the surviving east-Indian Carcikās hold the trident, often as the most conspicuous of their held attributes. Both the *Picumata* and the *Niśisaṃcāra* specify this as the weapon distinctive of the Karṇamoṭī of Devīkoṭa, and the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* says that it is because the goddess of this place slew the demons with her trident here that the site contains a sacred bathing-place called Śūlakuṇḍa 'the pond of the trident' and that anyone who drinks its water (*śūlodakam*) after doing obeisance to her will be safe from all harmful beings (171.124–125). The *Picumata* too refers to this Kuṇḍa.[530]

Finally, the pre-eminence of the emaciated goddess in the Śāktism of eastern India during this period is strongly underlined by the fact it is she that the Buddhists of the cult of Cakrasaṃvara chose to represent supine beneath the right foot of Śaṃvara and Vajravārāhī as the female representative of the Śākta Śaiva tradition.

In textual references to that Buddhist icon she is generally called Kālarātri. But there can be no doubt about her identity. For (1) she is called Carcikā in the *Vajravārāhīsādhana* of the Siddha Lūyī,[531] and Cāmuṇḍā in a Kalpa of the *Abhidhānottara* and in the anonymous *Trayodaśātmakavajraḍākinīvajravārāhīsādhana*, which is based upon it;[532] (2) Carcikā is called Kālarātri in a

---

mayāmala, the *Svayambhūyāmala*, the *Skandayāmala*, the *Sārasvatayāmala*, the *Gāndhārayāmala*, the *Īśānayāmala*, and the *Nandiyāmala*: you shall have these Tantras and others in thousands, and with them men will sacrifice to you in devotion. You will grant boons to men who sacrifice to you. Being goddesses of celestial power you will bestow celestial Siddhis. And women who sacrifice to you regularly with the secret [rites] will become Yogeśvarīs, women of celestial might'. On the list of Yāmalatantras in this passage and its relation to lists of such texts in the Vidyāpīṭha see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4. The *Brahmayāmala*, also called *Picumata*, teaches the worship of Bhairava as Hetuka surrounded with the Goddess by eight Vīras and twenty-four Yoginīs in its eightieth chapter (f. 306r2–3; 80.32–33): *hetukaṃ devadeveśaṃ kapālakṛtabhūṣaṇam | vīrāṣṭakayutaṃ madhye devadevaṃ parodayaṃ || kālāgnivāyusaṃyuktam adhordhvakṛtasaṃgatiṃ | nyaset svarūpabhāsvantaṃ tato yogigaṇaṃ nyaset*. It is striking that this reference to Hetuka, presumably the Bhairava of Devīkoṭa, is found in a chapter which is distinguished by being one of the very few passages in the Vidyāpīṭha that departs from the Tantric norm by containing material of the Purāṇic type, the subject which gives it its title being a myth of the origin of the skull-bowl and skull-staff (*kapālakhaṭvāṅgotpattiḥ*).

[526] Pāla period; black stone; 9 inches in height; now in the Varendra Museum in Rajshahi: *Huntington Archive*, Scan 0013117.

[527] Sena period; black stone; 25.75 inches in height; now in the National Museum, New Delhi: *Huntington Archive* Scan 0000308.

[528] See, e.g., *Kumārasambhava* 5.73cd; *Kathāsaritsāgara* 18.130d; *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 2.79–84; *Picumata* 3.32d–93, describing the depiction of the cremation ground at Prabhāsa: *tato nimbaṃ samālikhet | saptaḍālaṃ mahābhīmaṃ citibhiḥ prajvalantibhiḥ | ekaikasmiṃ likhet ḍāle nagnam udbaddhakaṃ naram* 'Then he should depict a Nimba tree with seven branches, most frightening with the burning pyres [around it]. On each branch he should draw a naked hanged man'; 15.16: *kṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṃ caturdaśyāṃ śavaṃ gṛhya tha sādhakaḥ | udbaddhaṃ śūlaprotaṃ vā akṣatāṅgaṃ tu dārakam*; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, *Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa* 8.71c–72b, describing the depiction of cremation grounds: *yāmyādyair nairṛtāntais tu diśair vṛkṣāṇ samālikhet || udbaddhanarapracchannāṇ*; Vajragarbha on *Hevajra* 1.7.21 (*dhvajaṃ śastrahataṃ caiva*) quoted in SNELLGROVE 1959, Pt. 1, p. 71, n.: *rgyal mtshan ni rgyal pos rkun po la sogs pa skyes pa 'am bud med 'ga' zhig chad pas bcad de lus mtshon gyis dral nas ro shing la dpyangs pa'o* '*a dhvajaḥ* is a corpse of some man or woman guilty of theft or some other crime whom the king has had executed with the sword, which has then been hung up on a tree [in the cremation ground]'.

[529] See here p. 112. That the sacred sites are the cremation grounds (*śmaśānam*) of the places listed is clear from the context in the *Picumata*, that (3.8–127) being a description of the nine cremation grounds that must be installed in the initiation Maṇḍala (*mahāmaṇḍalam*), one at the centre (Prayāga) and eight around the periphery (Vārāṇasī, Virajā [Jajpur in Orissa], Kollagiri [Kolhāpur in Karṇāṭaka], Prabhāsa [in Kathiawar], Ujjayinī [in Malwa], Bhūteśvara [in Mathurā?], Ekāmraka [Bhubaneswar in Orissa], and Koṭivarṣa). It is also clear from the account of Koṭivarṣa given in the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, since that prophesies that the site will become a great cremation ground (171.133c–134b): *koṭīvarṣam idaṃ sthānaṃ mātṝṇāṃ priyam uttamam || śmaśānaṃ pravaraṃ divyaṃ bhaviṣyati sukhapradam*.

[530] *Picumata* f. 8r3 (3.119c–121b): *īśāne tu diśābhāge koṭivarṣaṃ prakalpayet* || 120 *vaṭaṃ tatra samālikhya tatra śūlodakaṃ likhet | dikṣu caiva vidikṣu ca śūlaprotā likhet tathā* || 121 *śūla tasyāgrato likhya kuṇḍasyaiva mahātape*. It appears from this that the pond (*kuṇḍam*) was also known as the Śūlodaka.

[531] *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā* f. 11r1–2: *vāmabāhustanamaṇḍalahṛdayasambhava-*mīlitadakṣiṇāṅghriṃ* (em. : *mīlitā | dakṣiṇāṃghri* Cod.) *carcikā<ṃ> raktā<ṃ> dakṣiṇaśiraḥpatitā<ṃ>*.

[532] *Abhidhānottara*, Paṭala 56, A f. 173v2: *pādatalākrāntabhairavacāmuṇḍā* 'treading on Bhairava and Cāmuṇḍā with the soles of her feet'; *Trayodaśātmakavajraḍākinīvajravārāhīsādhana* in *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā*, f. 78r4–5: *pādākrānta*kṛtaśambhucāmuṇḍām* (em. : *kṛtāṃ | śambhuścāmuṇḍāṃ* Cod.). For the full visualiza-

verse by the east-Indian poet Bhāsoka;[533] and (3) the goddess beneath the foot of Śaṃvara/Vajravārāhī is depicted as emaciated, with sunken eyes and withered breasts, holding a skull-bowl and chopping knife in her two hands.[534] The emaciated Carcikās of our surviving images have four, six, eight, or ten arms, but the skull-bowl (*kapālam*) and chopping knife (*kartrikā*) are indeed among their four primary attributes, the other two being the trident and a severed head.[535] The goddess beneath the right foot is, as it were, the east-Indian Carcikā reduced to essentials: the emaciated body, the red colour, and only two arms, brandishing what were felt to be her two most basic attributes.

It is inconceivable, therefore, that east-Indians, for whom Śākta Śaivism was so central, then as now, would not have been conscious of the Śākta Śaiva guise of this new Buddhism; and it is equally inconceivable that they would have been blind to the fact that the humilated goddess supine beneath Śaṃvara's and Vajravārāhī's feet was the pre-eminent goddess of the east-Indian Śākta tradition. Clearly the east-Indian Buddhists who developed this iconography chose this goddess precisely because she occupied so prominent a position in that tradition and therefore would be instantly recognized.

In explanation of why this profound transformation of Buddhism occurred, we might be tempted to say that Buddhism was simply yielding ever more completely to the Śākta Śaiva religious tradition then dominant in the region, failing, as it were, to maintain its original purity in the face of this external pressure and the concomitant expectations of its patrons. This was perhaps how the matter would have been represented by the Śrāvakayānists; and no doubt there is some truth in this assessment, since it is extremely unlikely that east-Indian Buddhists would have chosen to develop this new manifestation of their religion if Śākta Śaivism had not become the pre-eminent religious idiom of the region. But

---

tion text of which this is part see ENGLISH 2002, p. 407, n. 207.

[533] *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* 126. For the east-Indian character of names in -oka see here p. 227.

[534] For this depiction see two stone sculptures from Ratnagiri in Orissa (LINROTHE 1999, figs. 198–202), two bronzes, one from Vikramaśīla and the other from an unrecorded site in eastern India (LINROTHE 1999, figs. 206–208), a Kashmirian bronze (PAL 1975, Plate 64a,b; LINROTHE 1999, fig. 211; *Huntington Archive* Scan 0059531), some early Tibetan bronzes (LINROTHE 1999, figs. 213–214), a Nepalese bronze of the fourteenth century (PAL 2003, fig. 31), a Nepalese bronze dated 1772 (REEDY 1997, fig. N299), a painting from Khara-khoto, before 1227 (RHIE and THURMAN 1991, fig. 92), and a Nepalese painting of the early seventeenth century (KREIJGER 1999, p. 53). In some Tibetan paintings Kālarātri's emaciation is absent (e.g., PAL 2003, fig. 117; KOSSAK and SINGER 1998, fig. 43; RHIE and THURMAN 1991, fig. 69.2); but that this is a secondary development can be inferred from its much more restricted occurrence.

[535] See Camunda (Cāmuṇḍā) in *Huntington Archive*.

the iconography of the humiliation of Carcikā and Bhairava and the extensive learned literature that developed around the kernel of the Yoginītantras alert us to the fact that those who created and refined this tradition saw the matter in an entirely different light. In their view they were not succumbing passively to an alien influence. Fully conscious that they were assimilating the dominant Śākta Śaiva idiom of the region, they justified their doing so as a means of converting non-Buddhists, taking their practices and encoding them with Buddhist meaning so that outsiders could rise effortlessly through what was familiar to them to what would save them, a view exactly reflected in Jayadratha's myth of the compilation of anti-Śaiva iconography, Śākta Śaiva liturgy, Mantras, and Buddhist doctrine as a means of luring devout Śaivas away from their faith.

For while the learned literature of Tantric Buddhism claims with sincere conviction that its special methods are designed for exceptionally able aspirants within the Buddhist fold,[536] its point of entry, namely initiatory introduction before the Maṇḍala, was designed to facilitate the recruitment of those outside it and to this end access was rendered as easy as possible. Thus in the seventh century the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* sets out a number of qualities to be sought in candidates but states that if even only one of these is present there is no need to investigate further;[537] and in the eight century the *Sarvatathāgata-*

---

[536] See, for example, the doctrine of the four points of superiority of the Tantric form of the Mahāyāna, the Mantranaya, over the non-Tantric Way of the Perfections (*pāramitānayaḥ*) asserted in the **Nayatrayapradīpa* by an author whose name appears in the Tenjur as Tripiṭakamala, an implausible name, perhaps an error for Tripiṭakamalla (*Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma*, f. 16v3: *de yang pha rol tu phyin pa'i theg pa chen po dang don gcig pa las de'i khyad par gang dag yod pa de brjod par bya'o | don gcig nyid 'ang ma rmongs dang | thabs mang dka' ba med phyir dang | dbang po rnon po'i dbang byas pas | sngags kyi bstan bcos khyad par 'phags* 'Moreover, although there may be no difference in the goal [of the Mantramahāyāna] from that of the Pāramitāmahāyāna the points that distinguish [the former] should be stated[. This has been done done in the following verse]: "Though the goal is one and the same the Mantraśāstra is superior (1) because it is free of delusion [on the path], (2) because it offers many methods [for reaching the goal], (3) because it is free of difficulties, and (4) because only those with the highest capacity are qualified [to undertake it]". The Sanskrit of the verse is preserved through citation (without attribution) in the *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Advayavajra (p. 8) (A), the *Sthitisamāsa* of his disciple Sahajavajra (f. 11v2 [6.5]) (B), and the anonymous *Subhāṣitasaṃgraha* (part 2, p. 31) (C): *ekārthatve 'py asaṃmohād *bahūpāyād* (AB Tib. [*thabs mang*] : *vajropāyād* C) *aduṣkarāt | tīkṣṇendriyādhikārāc ca mantraśāstraṃ viśiṣyate*. It has also been cited by Ka ro pa (Kāropā?), wrongly attributing it to a **Pradīpoddyotanatantra* (*sgron ma gsal ba'i rgyud*), in his commentary on the *Caturmudrānvaya* (MATHES 2008, p. 96). According to the view of some, as reported by Gzhon nu dpal, Ka ro pa was another disciple of Advayavajra (*Blue Annals*, pp. 842–843, 847–849, reported by MATHES [2008, p. 89] as saying that he was a disciple of Advayavajra's disciple Vajrapāṇi).

[537] *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud* (*Mahāvairocanā-*

tattvasaṃgraha goes so far as to prohibit the application of any criteria for distinguishing between those who are and are not worthy. Furthermore, it makes this open-door policy absolutely clear by specifying those to whom introduction before its Maṇḍala is intended to appeal:[538]

> Next is [the topic of] the detailed procedure that begins with the entry of Vajra disciples into this Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu. In this the first step is entry in as much it is the means of rescuing all persons without exception and of bringing about the accomplishment of the highest joy for the benefit of all. With regard to this entry before the Great Maṇḍala [the officiant] need not examine candidates to determine who is and is not worthy. Why is that? Venerable Tathāgatas, there are (1) people who have commited great sins. By seeing and entering this Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu they will be freed of all the bad rebirths [that would be the consequences of those sins].[539] Venerable [Tathāgatas], there are (2) people who are attached to every [kind of] wealth, food, drink, and other sense objects, who are [therefore] averse to [submitting to] the rules [of the initiated] (*samayāḥ*) and incapable of such disciplines as the Preliminary Observance (*puraścaraṇam*).[540] If they enter this [Maṇḍala] they too will have all their

---

bhisaṃbodhitantra), f. 162v4–6: *de nas de yi phyi de nyin | slob ma dad cing rigs btsun pa | de bzhin dkon mchog gsum la dad | zab mo yi ni blo dang ldan | spro ba che zhing tshul khrims ldan | bzod dang ldan zhing ser sna med | dpa' la yi dam brtan pa ni | bcu 'am brgyad dam bdun nam lnga | gcig gnyis bzhi las lhag kyang rung | dpyad mi dgos par gzung bar bya* 'Then, the next day, he should assemble candidates (1) with faith, (2) of good family, (3) with belief in the Three Jewels, (4) with deep understanding, (5) with great energy, (6) adhering to moral conduct, (7) patient, (8) free of envy, (9) intrepid, and (10) steadfast in their observances. They are acceptab]e without need for [further] examination if they have [all] ten, or eight, seven, five, one, two, four, or more [of these qualities].'

[538] *Sarvatathāgatasaṃgraha*, sections 210–213: *athātra vajradhātumahāmaṇḍale vajraśiṣyapraveśādividhivistaro bhavati | tatra prathamaṃ tāvat praveśo bhavaty aśeṣānavaśeṣasattvadhātuparitrāṇasarvahitasukhottamasiddhikāryakaraṇatayātra mahāmaṇḍalapraveśe pātrāpātraparīkṣā na kāryā | tat kasmād dhetoḥ | santi bhagavantas tathāgatāḥ kecit sattvā mahāpāpakāriṇaḥ | ta idaṃ vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalaṃ dṛṣṭvā praviṣṭvā ca sarvāpāyavigatā bhaviṣyanti | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ sarvārthabhojanapānakāmaguṇagṛddhāḥ samayadviṣṭāḥ puraścaraṇādiṣv aśaktāḥ | teṣām apy atra yathākāmakaraṇīyatayā praviṣṭānāṃ sarvāśāparipūrir bhaviṣyati | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ nṛttagāyahāsyalāsyāhāravihārapriyatayā sarvatathāgatamahāyānābhisamayadharmatānavabodhatvād anyadevakulamaṇḍalāni praviśanti | sarvāśāparipūrisaṃgrahabhūteṣu niruttararatiprītiharṣasaṃbhavakareṣu sarvatathāgatakulamaṇḍaleṣu śikṣāpadabhayabhītā na praviśanti | teṣām apāyamaṇḍalapraveśapathāvasthitamukhānām ayam eva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapraveśo yujyate sarvaratiprītyuttamasiddhisukhasaumanasyānubhavanārthaṃ sarvāpāyapratipraveśābhimukhapathavinivartanāya ca | santi ca punar bhagavanto dhārmikāḥ sattvāḥ sarvatathāgataśīlasamādhiprajñottamasiddhyupāyair buddhabodhiṃ prārthayanto dhyānavimokṣādibhir bhūmibhir yatantaḥ kliśyante | teṣām atraiva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapraveśamātreṇaiva sarvatathāgatatvam api na durlabhaṃ kim aṅga punar anyā siddhir iti.*

[539] The doctrine that the mere sight of the Maṇḍala destroys all one's sins is seen here in section 900: *tato yathāvan mukhabandhaṃ muktvā mahāmaṇḍalaṃ darśayet | maṇḍale dṛṣṭamātre tu sarvapāpair vimucyate* 'Then after duly removing the blindfold he should show him the Great Maṇḍala. As soon as he has seen it he is freed of all his sins'. But it is much older. It is already found in the *Mahāmaṇivipulavimānasupratiṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalpadhāraṇī*, which may be the earliest Buddhist text teaching consecration in the context of introduction to a Maṇḍala, here with the peculiarity that consecration precedes entry, while in the later tradition entry precedes consecration: f. 53v1–5 (Tib. f. 384v7): *tataḥ anena mantreṇābhiṣiñcya praveśayet*: OṂ MAṆIVIPULASUPRATIṢṬHITA*SIDDHE (Tib. : *siddha* Cod.) ABHIṢIÑCA MĀṂ *SARVATATHĀGATĀBHIṢEKAIR (Tib. : SARVATATHĀGATĀBHIṢEKAI Cod.) BHARA BHARA *SAṂBHARA SAṂBHARA (Tib. : SAṂBHARA Cod.) *HŪṂ HŪṂ (Cod. : HŪṂ Tib.) | *yathābhiṣiktamātraś ca sarvapāpāvaraṇāni pūrvajanmasaṃjātāni karmāvaraṇāni viśuddhāni bhavanti sarva*śuddhiparigṛhīto* (*śuddhi* em. : *śuddha* Cod.) *bhavati sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhitaḥ sarvatathāgatābhiṣiktaḥ* 'Then he should introduce him into the Maṇḍala after consecrating him with the Mantra OṂ MAṆIVIPULASUPRATIṢṬHITASIDDHE ABHIṢIÑCA MĀṂ SARVATATHĀGATĀBHIṢEKAIR BHARA BHARA SAṂBHARA SAṂBHARA HŪṂ HŪṂ. Merely through this consecration the obscurations of all his sins, the obscurations of his actions committed in previous lives, are eliminated. He possesses all purity. He has been entered-and-empowered by all the Tathāgatas. All the Tathāgatas have consecrated him'. According to the Zhen Yuan Catalogue of A.D. 800 (T. 2157–935a:26) the Chinese translation of this text (T. 1007) was prepared by an unknown translator of the Liang dynasty (503–557). However, I do not yet know if this passage is found in that translation.

[540] This is the practice otherwise known as *pūrvasevā*. It consists of a high number of repetitions of a Mantra along with ascetic restraints by means of which the practitioner qualifies himself to undertake procedures that require its use. See, e.g., *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*, p.236: *ādau tāvat parvatāgram āruhya viṃśallakṣāṇi japet | pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati | kṣīrāhāreṇa mauninā nānyatra mantragatacittena triśaraṇaparigṛhītena utpāditabodhicittena ca poṣadhaśīlasaṃvarasamādāpanābodhisattvasaṃvaraparigṛhītena japtavyam | tataḥ karmāṇi bhavanti* 'Before [beginning the Kalpa] he must first climb to a mountain top and [there] repeat the Mantra two million times. [Thus] the Preliminary Service [of the Mantra] will have been accomplished. He must repeat the Mantra while sustaining himself with [nothing but] milk, maintaining silence, with his mind fixed on the Mantra and nothing else, after taking the three Refuges, having formally resolved to attain the Awakening, and having taken up the Poṣadha fast, the restraint of morality, and the restraint of a Bodhisattva. [Only] then can the rituals be undertaken.' This, barring the specifically Buddhist vows, is exactly as prescribed in the Śaiva Mantramārga, where, as here, the terms *pūrvasevā* and *puraścaraṇam* / *puraścaryā* are standard and synonymous. See, e.g., *Niśvāsaguhya*, f. 80v3: *japamāna-m eva māsena pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati* 'By repeating the Mantra for a month the Preliminary Service will have been accomplished'; and Kṣemarāja *Svacchandoddyota* ad 7.104cd: *puraścaryā prathamam eva mantragrahapūrvaṃ vrataṃ niyatajapādikaraṇam* 'The *puraścaryā* is the observance that follows immediately after receiving the Mantra. It is to do a fixed number of repetitions [of that Mantra] with certain other [requirements].' Living on a diet of milk and maintaining silence is also a standard feature of Śaiva Mantra observances; see, e.g., *Niśvāsaguhya* f. 81r4: *daśāhaṃ kṣīrāhāreṇa japtavyaḥ kālamṛtyuṃ jayati*; f. 82vr4: *naktāśī kṣīrāhāro vā maunena tu japed yas tu | sa śivo 'bdena mānavaḥ*; f. 84v6: *anena mantreṇa kṣīrāhāro saṃvatsaraṃ japet*.

> hopes fulfilled in accordance with their desires. Venerable [Tathāgatas], there are (3) people who cannot grasp the nature of the understanding of the Mahāyāna of all the Tathāgatas because they are attached to dancing, singing, joking, amusements, and the pleasures of eating, and [so] take initiation before the Maṇḍalas of other[, non-Buddhist] families of deities. Being afraid of the moral regulations [of Buddhism] they do not enter the Maṇḍalas of the family of all the Buddhas, which comprise the fulfilment of all aspirations, which bestow the highest happiness, delight, and joy. It is for these too, who are inclined to enter the way of Maṇḍalas that lead to bad rebirths, that this entry into the Maṇḍala of Vajradhātu is appropriate, so that they may experience every happiness and delight, the highest Siddhi, joy, and contentment and be turned aside from the path that leads them to enter all [Maṇḍalas that result in] bad rebirths. Venerable [Tathāgatas], there are also (4) pious persons, who seek the Buddhas' enlightenment by means of the morality (*śīlam*), concentrations (*samādhiḥ*), and wisdom (*prajñā*) of all the Tathāgatas but who experience hardship as they strive to attain the levels of the meditations (*dhyānam*), liberations (*vimokṣaḥ*), and the other [states on the path taught in the Pāramitānaya]. They will easily attain All-Buddha-hood without difficulty in this very life (*atraiva*), all the more so other Siddhis, simply by entering this Maṇḍala of Vajradhātu.

Thus the text offered Maṇḍala initiation not only to Buddhists, and in particular to those who had found themselves unable to progress on the exacting path of the Pāramitānaya, but also to sinners and sensualists regardless of their religion, and, most important in the present context, to outsiders who had already taken a non-Buddhist Tantric initiation or might otherwise be expected do so.

The *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* does not tell us whether it has particular kinds of non-Buddhist Tantrics in mind. We can only guess from the character of the initiation ceremony, with its emphasis on possession, and the cult to which initiation leads, with its erotic and sensual elements, that Śākta Śaivas must have been intended. Later sources, however, do make clear that it is indeed the non-Buddhist followers of the kinds of practice being adapted by the Buddhists that are in mind. Thus Ānandagarbha, the period of whose activity, though not yet narrowly determined, may be assigned to the ninth century,[541] attempting in his commentary on the *Guhyasamājatantra* to explain the extraordinary fact that the place where the Buddha is said to have been residing at the time that he revealed this Tantra is the vaginas of the goddesses, declares:[542]

> If it is asked why he was residing in their private parts, the answer is [that this is] in order to bring it about that those devoted to the Tantras of Viṣṇu and the other [gods], who have not yet abandoned [their attachment to] the objects of the senses, may come through desire itself to delight in the abandoning of desire. For they seek to attain the Siddhis of such [gods] as Viṣṇu by resorting to women, and using such [offerings] as beef and urine. Those engaged in the quest for the Siddhis taught by these [gods do indeed] copulate with women [for this purpose]. For [it is said in their texts]: "Viṣṇu is Bhagavān ['the possessor of *bhaga-*'] in that he resides in the genitals (*bhaga-*) of women. He is called Nārāyaṇa [for the same reason,] because [by residing there] he gives pleasure to men".[543]

---

[541] The dating of Ānandagarbha in the ninth century seems probable solely on the grounds of the range of his exegesis, which covers the Yogatantra systems of the *Sarvatathāgataattvasaṃgraha* (his *Sarvavajrodaya*, his commentaries on the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* [Tōh. 2511]), the *Paramādya* (his commentary [Tōh. 2512]), the *Māyājāla* (his commentary [Tōh. 2513]), *Guhyasamāja* (his commentary [Tōh. 1917]), and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* (his commentary on the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* [Tōh. 1662]). In the last of these Tantric systems we also have in Sanskrit but not in Tibetan translation his *Vajrajvālodayā nāma śrīherukasādhanopayikā* in a codex photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in the Ngor monastery in Tibet which comprises apart from this work forty-one items pertaining to the cult of Hevajra (ISAACSON 1999). The dating is supported by the tradition (*Blue Annals*, p. 373) that he was a pupil of Dīpaṅkarabhadra, who was a pupil of Buddhajñāna, a contemporary of king Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812) (see here p. 93).

[542] *gSang ba 'dus pa'i dka' grel*, f. 4r3–5: *ci'i phyir de dag gis gsang ba la bzhugs she na | smras pa khyab 'jug la sogs pa'i rgyud la mngon par dga' zhing yul yongs su mi spong ba rnams ni 'dod chags kyis 'dod chags spong ba 'di la dga' ba bskyed par bya'i phyir te | 'di ltar bud med bsten pa dang *ba sha dang* (conj. : *bshad* Derge, Cone, Ganden) *gci la sogs pa bsten pas khyad 'jug la sogs pa bsgrub par 'dod cing | des bstan pa'i dngos grub tshol pa la zhugs pa de dag btsun mo'i gsang pa la mngon par 'jug par 'gyur te | de yang | bha ga legs ldan khyab 'jug ste | bud med kyi ni mdoms na gnas | mi rnams dga' bar byed pas na | des na sred med bu zhes bya zhes bshad do.*

[543] The unknown author of this verse intends a *nirvacanam* of *nārāyaṇaḥ*. A *nirvacanam* is a kind of semantic analysis that explains why a word is appropriate to that to which it is applied (*anvartha-*). When this is not thought to be adequately revealed through ordinary grammatical analysis one may resort to an analysis in which the meaning sought is discovered by deriving one or more of a word's syllables from a verbal root that resembles it in sound. See the analysis of Yāska's statement of this principle in KAHRS 1998, pp. 35–39. In this case the name is made to mean 'he who gives pleasure to men'. The first component in this analysis of *nārāyaṇaḥ* was evidently *nāra-*, understood as either as 'sons of man' (*nara-*) by *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.3.120 (*tasyedam*; cf. *Manusmṛti* 1.10ab in another *nirvacanam* of *nārāyaṇaḥ*: *āpo nārā iti proktā āpo vai narasūnavaḥ*), or as 'men' (*nara-*) by application of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6.3.136 (*anyeṣām api dṛśyate*) to account for non-standard lengthening of the first vowel. For these two alternatives see Kullūka on *Manusmṛti* 1.10ab and Medhātithi on the same for the second. Since *aya-* can mean 'good fortune', I speculate that the author found his meaning by deriving the last syllable, *-na*, from √*nī-* 'to lead [to]', arriving by this artifice at 'he who leads men to good fortune, i.e. happiness' (*nārān ayaṃ sukhaṃ nayatīti nārāyaṇaḥ*), the substitution of *ṇ* for *n* being caused by the preceding *r*. The artificial derivation of *-na* from √*nī-* is seen in the semantic analysis of *samānaḥ* for the fourth of the five vital energies implicit in, e.g., *Niśvāsanaya* 4.124ab (*Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* f. 40r3) (> *Svacchandatantra* 7.308d): *samānaḥ samatāṃ nayet*, and *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*

It comes as a surprise that Ānandagarbha attributes the extreme Tantric practices that he details here to Vaiṣṇavas, since nothing of this kind has been noted in their known literature. Because of this and because the use of female consorts, cow-flesh, urine and other products of the male and female body in the propitiation of deities for the attaining of supernatural powers or effects appears in our sources to be the hallmark of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha, and of the *Picumata* in particular,[544] it is tempting to propose that Ānandagarbha has made a mistake and that had he been better informed or less careless he would have attributed these practices to those whom we know to have adopted them. But this cannot easily be accepted in the light of the fact that he backs up his attribution by citing a verse that supports it. I conclude, therefore, that his claim is rather evidence that some Vaiṣṇavas had assimilated the transgressive, Śākta Śaiva style of observance, just as the Buddhists had. In any case, whatever the accuracy of this attribution, it is extremely unlikely that Ānandagarbha did not also have the Śākta Śaivas in mind when he referred to "those devoted to the Tantras of Viṣṇu and *other* [gods]".

Similarly Śraddhākaravarman, one of the Indian teachers of the Tibetan translator Rin chen bzang po (958–1055), says in his **Yoganiruttara-*

10.10cd: *samaṃ nayati gātreṣu samāno nāma mārutaḥ.*

[544] See, e.g., *Picumata* f. 280v4: 67.71 ***śaktigarte kṣipel liṅgaṃ tataḥ pūjā<ṃ> samārabhet | gati-r-āgatiyogena śaktivikṣobhatatparaḥ*** 'He should insert his penis into the vagina of his consort and then begin the worship, intent on bringing his consort to orgasm through to-and-fro motion'; f. 106v3–4: 22.152 ***śaktiṃ tu kṣobhayen mantrī vidyāyāṣṭasataṃ japet | mantrasya vā japec caiva svayāgavidhicoditaṃ || 153 dravyaprāśya purā kṛtvā gomāṃsaṃ kiñcisaṃyutaṃ | surāṣṭhinā samāyuktaṃ piṣṭaṃ piṇḍīkṛtan tathā || 154 kṣobhadravyeṇa saṃmardya liṅgākāraṃ tu kārayet | prakṣiped yonimadhye tu nimiṣaṃ cālya pīḍayet || 155 mantram uccārayen mantrī saṃkhyāyāṣṭaśataṃ tathā | karṣayitvā tu taṃ liṅgaṃ guḍikāṃ kārayet tataḥ || 156 japārcanavidhau nityaṃ pūjayet sādhakottamaḥ*** 'The Mantra-adept should arouse his consort and [as he does so] repeat the Vidyā 108 times. He should do the repetition of his Mantra as prescribed in the procedure for his set of deities. First he should swallow the substances. Then he should grind cow-flesh mixed with faeces and *surāṣṭhi* (urine?) into a ball, kneed it with the ejaculates, make it into the shape of a Liṅga, insert it into [his consort's] vagina, move it about for a short while and then compress it. The Mantra-adept should utter the Mantra 108 times, then withdraw the Liṅga, and make it into a pellet. The best of Sādhakas should always offer [this] when he performs the repetition of the Mantras and the act of worship'; f. 10v5: ***gomāṃsaṃ guggulaṃ caiva piṇyākaṃ laśunaṃ tathā || 3.210 siddhyarthaṃ guḍikā hy eta homayen nityakarmaṇi | maṇḍale tarpaṇaṃ kṛtvā gomāṃsasurayānvitaṃ*** 'Cow-flesh, bdellium, oil-cake, and garlic: he should offer this [mixture as a] pellet into the consecrated fire in his daily ritual'; f. 141v2 (28.38cd): ***gomāṃsaṃ surayā miśraṃ homayīta vicakṣaṇaḥ*** 'The adept should offer into the fire cow-flesh mixed with wine'; f. 39v3 (5.40ab): ***saṃpuṭe sthāpayitvā tu mūtrahomaṃ tu kārayet*** 'He should place urine in a bowl and offer it into the fire'.

tantrārthāvatārasaṃgraha, referring to the Yogatantras as the Tantras of Method (Upāyatantras) and to the Yoginītantras as the Tantras of Wisdom (Prajñātantras):[545]

> A Method Tantra is one in which the Maṇḍala shows mainly male deities in order to train (*vinī-*) men and insiders (*svayūthya-*), whereas a Wisdom Tantra is one in which, in order to train women and non-Buddhist outsiders (*bāhyatīrthika-*), the Maṇḍala shows mainly female deities, deities, that is, who are appropriate for these.[546] A Method Tantra is one that exhibits deities that purify the outer and inner aggregates of personality (*skandhāḥ*), the elements (*dhātavaḥ*), and the faculties and their objects (*āyatanāni*), whereas a Wisdom Tantra is one that exhibits deities that purify the outer and inner channels of the vital energy (*nāḍī*) and the Bodhicitta [semen]. A Method Tantra is one that exhibits deities [whose appearance and conduct are] in conformity with the [norms of] the world, whereas a Wisdom Tantra is one that exhibits deities [whose appearance is] contrary to [these norms of] the world.

Since Śraddhākaravarman states here that the predominance of female deities is designed to recruit non-Buddhists he can mean only the followers of Śākta Śaivism, since there is no other known group to whom this feature would have been particularly appealing. As for the other features that he identifies as distinctive of the Yoginītantras, he does not state explicitly that they were introduced with the same purpose in mind; but it seems to me probable that he means this to be understood, since the transgressive character of these deities, his third distinctive feature, is indeed a fundamental characteristic of the goddesses worshipped by these outsiders.

The Buddhism sponsored by the Pālas had come a long way: too far, in fact, for those conservative Buddhist monks at Vajrāsana who adhered to the ancient

---

[545] *rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa*, ff. 103v7–104r3: *gang du skyes pa dang rang gi sde pa 'dul ba'i phyir lha po'i rnam pa mang par ston pa'i dkyil 'khor ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du bud med dang phyi rol mu stegs can 'dul ba'i phyir de dag dang rjes su mthun pa'i lha mo'i rnam pa mang pa'i dkyil 'khor ston pa ni shes rab kyi rgyud do | gang du phyi nang gi phung po dang khams dang skye mched kyi rnam par dag pa'i lha ston pa ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du phyi nang gi rtsa dang byang chub kyi sems rnam par dag pa'i lha ston pa ni shes rab kyi rgyud do | gang du 'jig rten dang rjes su mthun pa'i lha'i rnam pa ston pa ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du 'jig rten dang 'gal ba'i lha'i rnam pa ston pa ni shes rab kyi rgyud.*

[546] Part of this formulation, namely the doctrine that the Yogatantras are designed to appeal to men and the Yoginītantras to women, has scriptural status, being found in the *mKha' 'gro ma'i dra ba'i rdo rje gur rgyud* (*Ḍākinīvajrapañjaratantra*), f. 104v5–6: *skyes bu rnams ni gdul ba'i phyir | rnal 'byor rgyud ni yang dag bshad | btsun mo rnams ni bsdu ba'i phyir | rnal 'byor ma yi rgyud bshad do* 'The Yogatantras were taught in order to train (**vinayanāya*) men. The Yoginītantras were taught in order to recruit (**saṃgrahāya*) women'.

Buddhism of the Śrāvakayāna. For according to the testimony of Tāranātha they broke up the silver image of Heruka in the temple and burnt the collection of Tantras housed there, saying that these were the teachings not of the Buddha but of Māra, the evil obstructor of the Buddha's enlightenment.[547]

THE REFLUX OF BUDDHIST ŚĀKTISM INTO THE ŚĀKTISM OF BENGAL. Indeed, Buddhism had assimilated the Śākta Śaiva style of religion so thoroughly that some of its creations went on to be adopted into the later Śākta Śaivism of eastern India with little or no revision. This is the case with the goddesses Chinnamastā and Ugratārā. The Buddhist origin of Chinnamastā is certain, since her Śākta Mantra is ŚRĪṂ HRĪṂ KLĪṂ AIṂ VAJRAVAIROCANĪYE HŪṂ HŪṂ PHAṬ SVĀHĀ, and the two companions that flank her are Ḍākinī and Varṇinī.[548] In the Buddhist prototype the flanking goddesses are Vajravarṇanī and Vajravairocanī, and the Mantra for recitation (*jāpamantraḥ*) is OṂ SARVABUDDHAḌĀKINĪYE OṂ OṂ VAJRAVARṆANĪYE OṂ VAJRAVAIROCANĪYE HŪṂ HŪṂ HŪṂ PHAṬ PHAṬ SVĀHĀ.[549] Moreover, the procedure of her visualization retains features distinctive of her Buddhist Sādhana, notably that one is to visualize the goddess standing on a red sun-disk marked with a Yoni triangle on a white lotus in one's navel.[550] The only differences here are that in the Buddhist Sādhana the triangle

---

[547] *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 168, ll. 14–: *he ru ka'i sku dngul las byas pa chen po zhig dang | sngags kyi glegs bam mang dag cig yod pa si nga gling pa sogs nyan thos se ndha pa 'ga' zhig gis 'di dag ni bdud kyis byas pa'o zhes byas nas | glegs bam rnams kyis bud shing byas | sku gzugs de yang dum bur bgos nas rnyed pa byas so* 'There was a great silver statue of Heruka and many manuscripts of [texts of the] Mantra[naya]. Some Saindhava Śrāvakas from such [regions] as Sri Lanka, saying that these manuscripts had been created by Māra, used them as fuel, and, moreover, after dividing up the image into pieces pocketed them'; *HBI*, p. 279.

[548] *Śāktapramoda*, p. 222 (her Mantra); pp. 221, 224–225 (the visualization of Chinnamastā, Ḍākinī and Varṇinī)

[549] *Abhisamayamañjarī*, pp. 151–152.

[550] *Śāktapramoda*, pp. 224–225, *Puraścaryārṇava*, p. 816, *Karmakāṇḍa*, vol. 4, p. 239d–240a (in the Kashmirian Śāktaśrāddha): *svanābhau nīrajaṃ dhyāyec chuddhaṃ vikasitaṃ sitam | tatpadmakośamadhye tu maṇḍalaṃ caṇḍarociṣaḥ | japākusumasaṃkāśaṃ raktabandhūkasaṃnibham | rajaḥsattvatamorekhāyonimaṇḍalamaṇḍitam | madhye tasya mahādevīṃ sūryakoṭisamaprabhām | chinnamastāṃ kare vāme dhārayantīṃ svamastakam | prasāritamukhīṃ bhīmāṃ lelihānāgrajihvikām | pibantīṃ raudhirīṃ dhārāṃ nijakaṇṭhavinirgatām | vikīrṇakeśapāśāṃ ca nānāpuṣpasamanvitām | dakṣiṇe ca kare kartrīṃ muṇḍamālāvibhūṣitām | digambarāṃ mahāghorāṃ pratyālīḍhapade sthitām | asthimālādharāṃ devīṃ nāgayajñopavītinīm | ratikāmopariṣṭhāṃ ca sadā dhyāyanti mantriṇaḥ* 'He should visualize a pure, open, white lotus in his navel, the disc of the sun in the centre of the seed-pod of that lotus with the colour of the Japā flower, resembling the red Bandhūka blossom, adorned by a Yoni triangle with [three] lines[, red, white, and black representing the Guṇas] Rajas, Sattva, and Tamas. At its centre Mantra adepts always visualize the Great Goddess Chin-

has the strictly Buddhist name *dharmodayā* and that the goddess is visualized as a transformation out of a yellow HRĪḤ visualized in that triangle.[551]

In the case of Tārā the Buddhist origin is even more apparent, since here the dependence extends to textual borrowing. For the Śākta literature of the worship of this goddess has incorporated the *Mahācīnakramatārāsādhana* of the Buddhist Śāśvatavajra, which appears almost in its entirety in the eleventh chapter of the Śākta *Phetkāriṇītantra*.

I am unable to determine within narrow limits how long after Śāśvatavajra this Tantra was composed.[552] The earliest mention of the text in sources known to me is in 2.15 of the *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, in a list of a canon of sixty-four Tantras cited from the *Toḍalatantra* but not appearing in the published text of that work. It is probable that Sarvānandanātha, who wrote his work in Senhati in what is now Bangladesh, was born around the beginning of the fifteenth century.[553] It is tempting to assume that the *Phetkāriṇī* was written at a time closer to Śāśvatavajra's than to Sarvānandanātha's, that is to

---

namastā shining like ten million suns, holding her own [severed] head in her left hand, fearsome, with the mouth [of her severed head] open wide, with the tip of her tongue licking greedily, drinking the stream of blood that gushes from her neck, her hair loosened, adorned with various flowers, holding a chopping-knife in her right hand, adorned with a garland of heads, naked, most terrible, standing in the Pratyālīḍha posture, with a necklace of bones and a snake as her sacred thread, standing on Kāma and Rati'.

[551] *Abhisamayamañjarī*, p. 151: *svanābhisthaśuklakamalasūryasthitasindūrāruṇadharmodayāmadhye pītahrīḥkārajā svayam eva kartitasvamastakaṃ vāmahastasthitaṃ dhārayantī …* 'Arising by transformation of a yellow syllable HRĪḤ in the centre of a vermilion-red Dharmodayā triangle upon a sun[-disc] on a white lotus in his navel, holding her own head, which she herself has severed, in her hand …'.

[552] The take-over of Śāśvatavajra's *Sādhana* of Ugratārā (= *Sādhanamālā* 101) by the *Phetkāriṇītantra* and its subsequent influence have been demonstrated by BÜHNEMANN (1996). Śāśvatavajra flourished around the last decades the tenth century and the first decades of the eleventh. His *Bāhyapūjāvidhi* (= *Sādhanamālā* 252), *Hastapūjāvidhi* (= *Sādhanamālā* 253), and *Cakrasaṃvarabalividhi* are found in the series of ritual texts published in FINOT 1934 from a manuscript brought to China in 1057 by the Dhyāna master Baocang on his return from India. His *Sādhana* of Ugratārā is found in the **Sādhanaśataka* (a facsimile of an undated Sanskrit palm-leaf manuscript from Tibet has been published in BÜHNEMANN 1994 = Tōh. 3306 ff.) and was translated into Tibetan by the Indian Paṇḍita *Amoghavajra and the Tibetan monk Bari Rin chen grags of Khams (Tōh. 3373; DT, Rgyud, Mu, f. 49v1, colophon: *rgya nag po'i rim pa'i sgrol ma'i sgrub thabs slob dpon rtag pa'i rdo rjes mdzad brjogs so | pa ṇḍi ta don yod rdo rje dang khams pa lo tsā ba dge slong ba ris bsgyur cing zhus so*). The latter was born in 1040 (*Blue Annals*, pp. 73 and 405) and was appointed to the chair of Sa skya in 1103 (*Blue Annals*, p. 211). A Sanskrit manuscript of his most important work, his commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvara*, translated by Bu ston Rin chen grub (Tōh. 1410), survives in the Potala Palace in Lhasa, where it awaits study.

[553] SANDERSON 2007b, p. 236, fn. 89.

say, when the Buddhist Mantranaya was still at its height in eastern India, before the destruction of the great monasteries around 1200. But this destruction did not eliminate Tantric Buddhism and its literature from the region at a single stroke. For it was still alive in the early fifteenth century, when Vanaratna (1384–1468) travelled to Tibet in 1426, 1433, and 1453, gave various Tantric initiations, notably in the *Kālacakra* according to the system of Anupamarakṣita, and assisted in the translation of Tantric texts, as is attested in the biography of this extraordinary figure given by Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481), [554] who collaborated with him in a translation of the **Trayodaśātmakaśrīcakrasaṃvaramaṇḍalavidhi* (Tōh. 1489). We also have the *Vanaratnastotrasaptaka*, a Sanskrit hymn in praise of Vanaratna composed during his lifetime by a devout lay Buddhist Āditya, whom both the Sanskrit and Tibetan colophons say was a native of Magadha;[555] and we have a manuscript of the Mahāyāna classic *Bodhicaryāvatāra* copied by a lay Buddhist in Bengali characters at Veṇugrāma in 1436.[556]

After her incorporation from the Mantranaya Tārā became with Dakṣinakālī and Tripurasundarī one of the three principal deities in the east-Indian Śākta system of the ten Mahāvidyās, which soon became widely disseminated throughout the subcontinent. Thus in a passage cited from the scripture *Jñānadvīpa* in the *Sarvollāsatantra* (3.1–29) the ten Mahāvidyās are said to be [Dakṣiṇa]kālī (Śyāmā), Tārā, and Tripurasundarī (Ṣoḍaśī), with the third dividing into eight: herself and the seven others that make up the total of ten, namely Bhuvaneśvarī, Bhairavī, Chinnamastā, Dhūmāvatī, Bagalāmukhī, Mātaṅgī, and Kamalā. The centrality of these three goddesses is reflected in the corpus of east-Indian Śākta scriptures. The *Toḍalatantra* teaches the rites of these three alone, and the *Bṛhannīlatantra* follows the same model but adds Kāmākhyā, the great goddess of Assam. Their centrality is also evident among the Paippalādin Atharvavedins of Orissa; for when they absorbed the influence of the Śāktism of Bengal in the latest stratum of their diverse *Āṅgirasakalpa* corpus it was principally the rites of Dakṣiṇakālī and Tārā that they adopted.[557]

The importance of Tārā in late east-Indian Śāktism is independently

---

[554] *Blue Annals*, pp. 797–805. On the career of Vanaratna see ERHARD 2004.

[555] HAHN 1996, p. 37: *samāptam idaṃ [vana]ratnastotrasaptakam | kṛtir magadhadeśīyādityānām iti*; p. 40: *dpal ldan bla ma nags kyi rin chen bstod pa bdun pa 'di ni rdzogs so | yul ma ga dhā nas byung ba'i bsnyen dam pa nyi ma pa zhes bya bas mdzad pa'o* (**samāptam idam śrīguruvanaratnastotrasaptakam | kṛtir magadhadeśīyaparamopāsakādityānām*).

[556] SHASTRI 1917, p. 21: ASB MS 8067. The scribe identifies himself as Sadbauddhakaraṇakāyasthaṭhakkura Amitābha.

[557] SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 235–236, fn. 88.

confirmed by the existence of substantial texts devoted exclusively to her worship, notably the *Tārārahasyavṛtti* of Gauḍīya Śaṅkara composed in 1630, the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava*, a work in some 11,000 verses composed by Nṛsiṃha Ṭhakkura c. 1688, the *Tārābhaktitaraṅgiṇi* of Kāśīnātha, composed in 1682 at the request of Kṛṣṇacandra, Mahārāja of Nadia in West Bengal, and two other works with the same title, one by Vimalānandanātha and the other by Prakāśānandanātha.

THE JAINS' ADAPTATION OF THE ŚAIVA MANTRAŚĀSTRA

Jainism too enjoyed royal support during this period, notably in western India under the Caulukyas and in Karṇātaka among the Gaṅgas of Taḷakāḍ, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and Hoysaḷas;[558] and it too developed a Tantric ritual culture along Śaiva lines for the propitiation (*ārādhanā*) of Mantra-goddesses for mundane benefits using Mudrās, Japa, and offerings into fire (*homaḥ*). Among goddesses worshipped in Jaina rites for such purposes are Lakṣmī and Vāgīśvarī (Sarasvatī) belonging to the higher world, the Vidyādevīs belonging to the middle,[559] and, most important, in the lower world the Yakṣī attendants of the Tīrthaṅkaras, associated with major Jaina pilgrimage sites, notably Ambikā (/Kūṣmāṇḍinī), the attendant of Neminātha at Girnār, Cakreśvarī, the attendant of Ṛṣabha at Śatruñjaya, Padmāvatī, the attendant of Pārśvanātha at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, and Jvālāmālinī, the attendant of Candraprabha.[560]

That these deities were developed on the basis of the Śaiva tradition is more transparently obvious here than in Buddhism. Thus the *Bhairavapadmāvatīkalpa*, the Digambara Malliṣeṇa's Paddhati on the propitiation of Padmāvatī, written in 1057 equates her with Totalā, Tvaritā, Nityā, Tripurā, and Tripurabhairavī, all well-known Mantra-goddesses of the Śākta Śaivas.[561]

---

[558] See STEIN 1998, especially pp. 147–152.

[559] In the classical listing these are the following eighteen: Rohiṇī, Prajñapti, Vajraśṛṅkhalā, Vajrāṅkuśā, Apraticakrā, Puruṣadattā, Kālī, Mahākālī, Gaurī, Gāndhārī, Sarvāstramahājvālā, Mānavī, Vairoṭyā, Acchuptā, Mānasī, and Mahāmānasī.

[560] For images of Ambikā, Cakreśvarī, Padmāvatī, and Jvālāmālinī see, e.g., *AIISPL*, Accession numbers 45246, 10029, 58659, and 19995. On the cult of Padmāvatī see JHAVERY 1944. On the cult of Jvālāmālinī see SETTAR 1969.

[561] On the worship of goddesses in Jainism and their division between the three worlds (*ūrdhvalokaḥ*, *tiryaglokaḥ*, and *adholokaḥ*) see CORT 1987. On the centrality of the culture of Mantras and Mantrasiddhas in medieval Jainism see the survey and analysis by Paul DUNDAS (1998), who writes there of "the Jain *mantraśāstra*'s partial linkage to an ultimately Śaiva-inspired style of religiosity" (p. 36), of the *Jñānārṇava* of the Digambara Śubhacandra, probably in the tenth century, that it "blends much of the "software" of Śaiva *mantraśāstra* with specifically Jaina so-

Unlike Śaivism, Pañcarātra, and Tantric Buddhism in its mature form, Jaina Tantrism did not claim to offer Jainas a new path to liberation. It remained entirely focused on mundane benefits. Nonetheless it was not the preserve of the laity. Monks produced the manuals and monks were held to perform these propitiations. Thus Yaśobhadrasūri and other Mantra-adepts (*māntrikāḥ*) use the power that they have obtained by propitiating the goddess Kurukullā to unblock the throat of Devācārya when on the sixteenth day of a debate in the court of the Caulukya Siddharāja between him and the Digambara Kumudacandra the latter had used his supernatural power to silence him by causing him to choke;[562] the Jaina Guru of king Ajayapāla undertakes a two-month propitiation of Ambikā on the Raivataka mountain at Girnār in order to gain for himself the boon of equality with the renowned Śvetāmbara Hemacandra and for his patron that of equality with Kumārapāla, the great Caulukya king of Gujarat.[563] Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri go to the same mountain at night to undertake the propitiation of the Siddhacakramantra, after first performing preliminary rites to summon the presiding goddess Ambikā into their presence;[564] and Hemacandra propitiates the spell-goddess Tribhuvanasvāminī in Aṇahillapattana, the Caulukya capital, in order to ask her about the previous birth of his pupil Kumārapāla.[565]

As in the non-Jaina tradition the goddesses were put to work to serve the interests of rulers. The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅgācārya, written at Vardhamāna (Vaḍhvān) in eastern Kāṭhiāvāḍ in 1304, claims that Padmāvatī was propitiated by means of a fire-sacrifice by a Digambara monk in order to protect Vārāṇasī, the capital of king Jayacandra (in the late twelfth century), from attack by a Muslim army;[566] bards in Karṇāṭaka at the court of Yaśodhara

---

teriological concerns" (p. 35), and of the *Bhairavapadmāvatīkalpa* that it "contains an account of the well-known six magical arts (*ṣaṭkarmāṇi*), not greatly dissimilar from their Hindu equivalents" (p. 33).

[562] Merutuṅga, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 169: *ṣoḍaśe dine ākasmike devācāryasya kaṇṭhāvagrahe māntrikaiḥ śrīyaśobhadrasūribhir atulyakurukullādevīprasādalabdhavarais tatkaṇṭhapīṭhāt kṣaṇāt kṣapaṇakakṛtakārmaṇānubhāvāt keśakaṇḍukaḥ pātayāṃ cakre.*

[563] *Kumārapāladevaprabandha* §54: *cintitaṃ devatārādhanaṃ vinā manorathānāṃ siddhir na | ato raivatake gatvā devīm ambāṃ paritoṣya hemācāryasamo bhaviṣyāmi | upavāsatrayaṃ tad anu talahaṭṭikāyāṃ pāraṇam | ekaḥ paricaryākaraḥ | evaṃ māsa 2 tapaḥprānte devy ambā pratyakṣā jātā kāryaṃ vada | tenoktaṃ yādṛśaḥ kumārapāladevas tādṛśam ajayapāladevaṃ yādṛśo hemācāryas tādṛśaṃ māṃ vidhehīti.*

[564] *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §61. On the worship of the Siddhacakra see Jhavery 1944, pp. 167–169.

[565] *Kumārapāladevaprabandha* §21.

[566] *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 294–295.

are said to have invoked Aparājitā to secure the king victory in battle;[567] and these powers are fully confirmed by the manuals for these rites. According to the unpublished *Jvālāmālinīkalpa*, composed by the Digambara Indranandin in Karṇāṭaka in 939, the benefits that can be attained by propitiating Jvālāmālinī include the splitting open of the gates of enemy forts; and the *Bhairavapadmāvatīkalpa* teaches a spell (*vidyā*) for making one's enemies fall asleep and magical receipts both for causing dissension among them (*vidveṣaṇam*) and causing their death (*māraṇam*). Moreover, Padmāvatī was the lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) of a number of Jaina ruling houses in Karṇāṭaka[568] and functioned in this capacity much as she would have done if they had not been converted. Thus she appears in a local manifestation as the Padmāvatī of Śaśakapura (Sosavūru) in a Jaina myth of the origin of the name of the Hoysaḷa (/Poysaḷa) dynasty related in an inscription of 1133.[569] When a Jaina ascetic Yogin was trying to subjugate this goddess with a Mantra and a tiger sprang out to break its power the ascetic commanded king Saḷa, saying "Strike [it], O Saḷa" (*poy saḷa*).[570] The king then worshipped the goddess under the name Vāsantikā. Since this story introduces an account of the conquests of the dynasty it is probable that the goddess is seen here in the manner of the martial lineage goddesses of the Śākta Śaiva type venerated by non-Jaina kings during the early medieval period as the source of their sovereignty and military might.

In one important respect, however, Jaina lineage goddesses were bound to differ from their non-Jaina counterparts. Since Jainas are the strictest of vegetarians and are rigorously opposed to the harming of any living creature, their goddesses, like those of the Buddhists, had to renounce the animal sacrifices that were so conspicuous a part of their cult in non-Jaina lineages.[571] Thus the Osvāl

---

[567] Cort 1987, p. 248.

[568] Notably the Śilāhāras, Rāṭṭas, and Śāntaras; see Cort 1987, p. 243.

[569] *EC* 5:124.

[570] Cf. *EI* 6:10, l. 6: *sa hoy saḷeti prāpat taṃ kila vinihatya hoysaḷākhyām.*

[571] In the Buddhist case, however, animal sacrifice, though unusual, does occur. We see it in the *mahābali* sacrifice performed by the Buddhist Newars at Lagaṅkhel on the occasion of the chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara (Karuṇāmaya); see Sinclair 2008. Nor is this a recent innovation. See *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* ff. 30r2–32r3. The Mantra for the Bali there (f. 31v2–) is derived from a Śaiva prototype seen in the Vidyāpīṭha's *Niśisaṃcāra* (14.56–63; ff. 47v5–48v2: *ekavṛkṣe śmaśāne vā* . . .). My pupil Péter-Dániel Szántó has kindly informed me (personal communication, 4 March, 2009) that the verses that immediately precede that Mantra in this manuscript, containing the reference to sanguinary offerings, are not part of the original *Catuṣpīṭha* but have been added from the *Catuṣpīṭhamaṇḍalopāyikā* of Caryāvratipāda (19.30–33 [f. 20r]). On that work, its author, and the incorporation of material from it in this MS of the *Catuṣpīṭha* see Szántó 2008a. He has also drawn my attention to references to sanguinary offerings elsewhere in the *Catuṣpīṭha* itself, in the Sādhana of Ḍākinī (2.4.63–66) and in that of Cūṣiṇī (2.4.75),

Jainas of Rajasthan and Saurashtra hold that their lineage deity Saccikā or Sacciyā adopted her present non-violence only when she and they were converted to Jainism by the monk Ratnaprabhasūri, probably in the twelfth century,[572] in consequence of his having miraculously cured a boy of snake-bite when he had already been thought dead and prepared for cremation. They claim that before their conversion they had been Rajput warriors—a claim also found among other Jain castes—[573] and she a fierce Cāmuṇḍā whom they propitiated with the Tantric rites of the Vāmamārga. Her pre-Jaina past is still visible in her temple at Osiān near Jodhpur, the Osvāls' original home. For the outer wall of her innermost shrine shows images of Cāmuṇḍā, Mahiṣāsuramardinī, Śītalā, and a naked Bhairava.[574]

We have another story of the conversion of a lineage goddess in Jaina accounts of the life of the Caulukya king Kumārapāla of Gujarat (r. 1143–1174), who converted from Śaivism to Jainism under the influence of the illustrious Śvetāmbara scholar monk Hemacandra. According to these accounts Kaṇṭheśvarī, the lineage goddess of the Caulukyas, and the other goddesses associated with her had always been placated during the nine days of the annual

---

and to a reference to the attracting of animal and human victims (*paśuḥ*) at the end of the ninth chapter of the *Vajraḍāka*. That passage is derived from *Laghuśaṃvara* 32.1–2 and 31.2–3b. See also here p. 182, on human sacrifice.

[572] See DUNDAS 2002, p. 149.

[573] On the claims of Rajput *kṣatriya* ancestry among the Jain castes of the Osvāls, Khaṇḍelvāls, Agravāls, and Śrīmāls see BABB 1993, pp. 7–8.

[574] AGRAWALA 1954 and 1956; CORT 1987, pp. 243–244; and BABB 1993, pp. 9–10, following accounts in BHŪṬORIYĀ 1988. For photographs of the Camuṇḍā and Mahiṣāsuramardinī see *AIISPL*, Accession numbers 59386 and 59388. An account of the conversion of Saccikā is found in a chronicle, the *Upakeśagacchapaṭṭāvalī*, of the monastic community followed by the Osvāl laity, which ends with the installation of Siddhasūri in [Vikrama] 1655. See pp. 237–238 of the translation by HOERNLE (1890), who does not provide the original, for which see AGRAWALA 1954. Ratnaprabhasūri describes Saccikā in that account as follows (HOERNLE's translation, p. 237), addressing her former devotees: 'O ye faithful, ye should not go to the temple of Sachchikā-devī; she is merciless, and incessantly delights in hearing the sound of the breaking of bones and the killing of buffaloes, goats, and other animals; the floor of her temple is stained with blood, and it is hung about with festoons of fresh skins; the teachers of her devotion, rites, and service, are cruel men; she is altogether disgusting and horrible'. The text continues: 'Hearing these words of the *Āchārya*, they replied,— "What you say, O Lord, is quite true; but if we do not go to worship that cruel Devī, she will slay us and our families." The *Āchārya*, however, promised to protect them; whereupon they ceased to go any longer to the temple of the Devī'. Ratnaprabhasūri then goes on to convert the goddess, a tradition also asserted in an inscription of 1598 (CORT 1987, p. 244). Thereafter, it is said, she would accept no sanguinary offerings and not even red flowers, because they resemble such offerings.

Navarātra festival by the sacrifice of thousands of goats and buffaloes.[575] But this stops when Kumārapāla, now a convert to Jainism, declares a fourteen-year ban on the taking of life. Kaṇṭheśvarī appears before the king and demands to know why she and the other goddesses have been denied their usual sacrifices. When he explains that he cannot sacrifice to her now that he is a Jaina she is enraged and strikes him on the head with her trident, causing leprous sores to break out on his body. Hemacandra miraculously cures his affliction, tries to persuade the goddess to accept in future offerings of vegetarian food of equal value, and when this fails binds her with a Mantra. Thoroughly humbled, she begs the king to free her, promising that if she is released she will give up her ways and work instead to police his ban on the slaughter of animals throughout his realm. With Hemacandra's permission he releases her and she takes to her new role as the king's informer with all the zeal of the convert.[576] She reports a vassal king in Saurāṣṭra for secretly butchering goats in his home: Kumārapāla sends his minister Udayana at the head of an army to punish him.[577] She reports a merchant for plucking a louse from his wife's head and crushing it: his entire property is seized and the money used to fund the building of a Jaina monastery, named accordingly the Monastery of the Louse (Yūkāvihāra).[578]

---

[575] Three thousand seven hundred goats and thirty-seven buffaloes were to be sacrificed: a hundred goats and one buffalo on the first day, two hundred goats and two buffaloes on the second, three hundred goats and three buffaloes on the third, and so on, so that nine hundred goats and nine buffaloes were sacrificed on the ninth (Mahānavamī). See Somatilakasūri, *Kumārapāladevacarita* vv. 387–389: *śuddhasamyaktvapūtātmā mahānavamīparvaṇi | kumārapālabhūpāla āmigādibhir ākhyata* || 388 *devī *kaṇṭheśvarī* (corr.: *kaṃṭeśvarī* Ed.) *gotradevī svaṃ bhāvyam īhate | ekaṃ chāgaśataṃ caiko mahiṣaḥ pratipaddine* || 389 *etāvad eva dviguṇaṃ dvitīye divase punaḥ | tṛtīye triguṇaṃ yāvan navame *navasaṃguṇam* (corr.: *nava saṃguṇam* Ed.); and *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §75: *athāmāriṃ pravartayati rājani āśvinaśuklapakṣo 'gāt | tatra *kaṇṭheśvaryādidevatānām* (*kaṇṭheśvaryādi* corr.: *kaṇṭeśvaryādi* Ed.) *arcakair vijñaptaṃ deva saptamyāṃ sapta śatāni paśavaḥ sapta mahiṣāś ca devatānāṃ puro dīyante rājñā | evam aṣṭamyām aṣṭau śatāni navamyāṃ nava śatānīti*. In the editions of the *Kumārapāladevacarita* and the *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* the goddess' name appears in the form Kaṇṭeśvarī. I have corrected this to Kaṇṭheśvarī on the dubious strength of a passage in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga in which the author implies that she owes her name to the fact that in the eighth century Vanarāja, the founder of the Cāpotkaṭa dynasty that preceded the Caulukyas at Aṇahillapattana, had a shrine built for her in the *kaṇṭhaḥ* ('narrow entrance'?) of his palace (p. 35: *tathā ca tena dhavalagṛhakaṇṭhe kaṇṭheśvarīprāsādaś ca kāritaḥ*).

[576] *Kumārapāladevacarita*, vv. 387–396 and *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §75.

[577] *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §85.

[578] *Kumārapāladevacarita*, vv. 404–406; cf. *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §77. The same sources relate another occasion on which the Jaina Mantravāda was used to curb a sanguinary goddess. Hemacandra and Yaśaścandra fly through the

Thus, while drawing heavily on the Śākta Śaiva tradition of the propitiation of Mantra-goddesses, the Jain Mantravāda, was bound to keep itself free of the sanguinary aspects of those cults and, also, one would assume, of all other transgressive elements that would conflict with the ascetic character of the Jaina path, notably the use of flesh and alcohol, and the employment of female consorts. However, that exclusion was not as complete as one would expect in respect of the last of these elements. This is apparent in the accounts of two of the propitiations mentioned above. We are told that when Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri undertook the propitiation of the Siddhacakramantra on the Raivataka mountain they did so with a Padminī in the person of the wife of a village headman as their Tantric assistant (*uttarasādhakatvena*).[579] How the wife of the village headman assisted in the propitiation is not stated. But the story of Hemacandra's propitiation of Tribhuvanasvāminī is more explicit. Again he has the assistance of a Padminī. The daughter-in-law of a farmer is brought to the city for this purpose and the goddess shows her favour after Hemacandra has repeated the Mantra for three days on the Padminī's vulva (*tasyā yonau*).[580] The text tells us that Hemacandra's mind remained undisturbed during this practice, no doubt wishing to stress that he was not compromising the monastic rule of celibacy. Indeed there is no evidence of which I am aware that the Jaina Mantravāda, unlike Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism in its later phases, created two levels of discipline, one for ordinary practitioners and one for an élite that transcended the rules that apply to the first. Nonetheless, we see from this story that it had gone surprisingly far in this direction, too far for some, one suspects, who would have preferred monks to avoid any practice in which they could be suspected of departing from the straight and narrow Jain path of purification.

ŚAIVISM IN THE BRAHMANICAL SUBSTRATE

As for the long-established brahmanical tradition, the Śaivas saw it as subsumed within their own, accepting it as the only valid source of authority in what they saw as the lesser domain of mundane religion (*laukiko dharmaḥ*). This perception is much emphasised in their literature,[581] and it is expressed through the

---

air from Aṇahillapattana to Bhṛgupura (Bhṛgukaccha, Bharukaccha, modern Bharuch/Broach) and attempt to tame the Tantric goddess Saindhavā, who had possessed the minister Āmbaḍa. She shows her contempt for Hemacandra by sticking out her tongue. Yaśaścandra punishes her by pounding some grains of rice in a mortar. The first blow causes her temple to quake, and the second and third cause her image to shudder and then be dislodged. She falls at Hemacandra's feet begging for his protection. See Somatilakasūri's *Kumārapāladevacarita*, vv. 76–85 and *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §87. Saindhavā is no doubt the Sindhavāī Mā whose temple is located outside the walls of Broach to the north, not far from the temple of Nīlakaṇṭha. She was receiving goat sacrifices on Mahānavamī up to the 1940s (DESAI 1993, p. 48). According to Somatilakasūri, she was the principal of the non-Jaina deities of the city. Sindhavāī Mā also has temples in Ahmedabad, near Bilimora, and Kayavarohana, Vadodara.

[579] *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §61: *te ca trayaḥ kṛtapūrvakṛtyāḥ śrī-ambikākṛtasānnidhyāḥ śubhadhyānadhīradhiyaḥ śrīraivatādevatādṛṣṭau triyāminyām āhvānāvaguṇṭhanamudrākaraṇamantranyāsavisarjanādibhir upacārair gurūktavidhinā samīpasthapadminīstrīkṛtottarasādhakakriyāḥ śrīsiddhacakramantram *asādhayan* (em.: *asādhayat* Ed.). 'And those three, after performing the preliminary service (*pūrvasevā*) and bringing about the presence of Ambikā, with their mind firmly concentrated in the 'pure' mode of meditation, in the sight of the goddess of the Raivataka mountain, performed at night the Sādhana of the Siddhacakramantra following the procedure taught by the Guru, with all the [required] rites of summoning, enclosing, making the Mudrās, installing the Mantras [on their bodies], dismissing and the rest, with the actions of the Tantric assistant performed by that Padminī beside them'. According to the erotological literature Padminīs are one of four classes of ideal love-partner (*nāyikā*); see, e.g., *Pañcasāyakamañjarī* 1.6: *sampūrṇendumukhī kuraṅganayanā pīnastanī dakṣiṇā mṛdvaṅgī vikacāravindasurabhiḥ śyāmātha gauradyutiḥ | alpāhāraratā vilāsakuśalā haṃsasvanā sadgatir lajjālur gurudevapūjanaparā syān nāyikā padminī*; and in Tantric literature *Hevajratantra* 2.7.2–5 and *Saṃvarodayatantra* 31.3–5b.

[580] *Kumārapāladevaprabandha* §21: *atha śrīhemācāryais tribhuvanasvāminīṃ vidyām ārādhayitukāmā bhāṇḍāgārikaṃ kapardinaṃ prāhur yan mehatāgrāme trihuṇasiṃhaḥ kauṭumbikaḥ | tasya putrāś catvāraḥ | laghor vadhūḥ padminī | yadi sāyāti tadā *tasyā avācyapradeśe* (corr.: *tasyāvācyapradeśe* Ed.) *dinatrayaṃ jāpe datte devī prasīdati | etad atiduṣkaram | kapardinoktam | cintā na vidheyā | bhāṇḍāgārikas tatra gataḥ kauṭumbikagṛhe | tena satkṛtaḥ | prayojanaṃ pṛṣṭaḥ | bhāṇḍāgārikenoktam laghuputravadhūṃ mamārpaya | tenoktaṃ kim idam ādiśasi | evam eva | vicāro 'pi na kartavyaḥ | tenoktaṃ yadi bhavatāṃ *vicāre samāyātam idam* (?) *tadaivam astu | sukhāsane 'dhiropya pattane samāgataḥ | śrīhemasūribhiḥ paramānnāhāraparair avikṛtacittais tasyā yonau dinatrayaṃ jāpaḥ kṛtaḥ | devī tuṣṭā* 'Then Hemācārya, desiring to propitiate the spell-deity Tribhuvanasvāminī said to his treasurer Kapardin: "There is a farmer called Trihuṇasiṃha in Mehatā village. He has four sons. The wife of the youngest is a Padminī. If she comes here and I offer Japa for three days on her unmentionable part the goddess will favour me. This is extremely difficult [to accomplish]". Kapardin told him not to worry. So the treasurer went to the home of the farmer in that [village] and after being honoured was asked his purpose. The treasurer said: "Give me the wife of your youngest son". [The farmer] said: "Is this an order?". He replied that it was but that he should not be concerned. [The farmer] said: "So be it, if this is *what you have decided after due deliberation (?)". So [the treasurer] put her in a comfortable sedan and returned with her to the capital. The venerable Hemasūri did the Mantra-recitation on her vulva for three days, intent on eating *paramānnam*, with his mind undisturbed [by lust]'. The goddess was pleased'. The food *paramānnam* is, I presume, the dish of rice, milk, and sugar or jaggery otherwise known as *pāyasam* and considered the ideal food for offering to a vegetarian deity.

[581] It is encapsulated in the often cited words of their scripture *Bhārgavottara*: *iti varṇāśramācārān manasāpi na laṅghayet | yo yasminn āśrame tiṣṭhan dīkṣitaḥ śivaśāsane | sa tasminn eva saṃtiṣṭhec chivadharmaṃ ca pālayet* 'So he should not transgress the practices of his caste and [brahmanical] discipline even in thought.

collocation of the epithets *paramamāheśvaraḥ* and *paramabrahmaṇyaḥ* that is sometimes found with the titles of our kings in inscriptions.[582]

But the brahmanical tradition was not merely accepted by the Śaivas. It was also influenced by them. During this period we find an ever-growing corpus of traditions that while claiming to be on the brahmanical side of the divide derive from the Śaiva, both Śaiva devotional literature assigned to the Purāṇas and a form of worship that followed Śaiva models. In Purāṇic texts such as the *Uttarabhāga* of the *Liṅgapurāṇa*,[583] the *Kālikāpurāṇa*, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and the *Agnipurāṇa*,[584] the boundary between the Smārta and Tantric domains has almost completely dissolved, prompting the conservative brahmanical author Ballālasena, the twelfth-century Sena king of Gauḍa, to reject them as invalid as sources of the knowledge of religious duty, objecting particularly to their containing instruction on such matters as Śaiva initiation and idol consecration.[585]

In reality there was no reasonable hope of turning the tide by this period, as had to be conceded even by so conservative an authority as the *Nibandha* on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* compiled by or under Aparāditya, the Śilāhāra king of Koṅkaṇa in the last quarter of the twelfth century. While firmly denying in general the validity of the practices taught in the Śaiva scriptures, it admits a partial exception in the case of the Sthāpaka, the priest who consecrates idols and shrines. It is admitted that he may draw on these texts to supplement the

---

He should remain in the discipline in which he was when he was initiated into the Śaiva religion and [at the same time] maintain the ordinances of Śiva'; see SANDERSON 1988, p. 662 (= 1990, p. 139); 1995, p. 23; 2005a, p. 389; 2007a, pp. 231–232. The Śaivas' understanding of how the relation between the general, Vaidika ordinances and those of the Śaiva scriptures should be perceived is explored at length in SANDERSON forthcoming *b*.

[582] We see this combination in the case of the Pāṇḍuvaṃśins/Pāṇḍavas of Mekalā in the fifth century (SHASTRI 1995, nos. II: I–II), the Śailodbhava Mādhavarāja of Koṅgoḍa in the seventh (*EI* 6:14), the Pallavas Parameśvaravarman I (c. 669–690) and Narasiṃhavarman II (c. 690–728/9) (MAHALINGAM 1988, nos. 45, 53) around the turn of the seventh and eighth, the Bhañja Neṭṭabhañja of Orissa in the eighth (*EI* 28:41, ll. 16–17), the descendants of King Nimbara of Kārtikeyapura in Himachal Pradesh in the ninth and tenth (*EI* 31:38), and the Eastern Cālukyas in the eleventh (*EI* 6:35; *EI* 6:36).

[583] On the presence of the Śaiva Mantramārga in its Saiddhāntika, Dakṣiṇa (Bhairava), and Śākta forms in the *Uttarabhaga* of the *Liṅgapurāṇa* see SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 235–236.

[584] On the *Agnipurāṇa*'s incorporation of the Saiddhāntika Śaiva Paddhati of Somaśambhu see p.65 above.

[585] In vv. 55-67 of the introduction to his *Dānasāgara* Ballālasena rejects on these and allied grounds the *Garuḍapurāṇa*, the *Brahmapurāṇa*, the *Agnipurāṇa*, the *Vaiṣṇavapurāṇa* in twenty-three thousand verses, the *Liṅgapurāṇa* in six thousand, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and parts of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. That he did not include the *Kālikāpurāṇa* in his list strongly suggests that it postdates him.

ritual of consecration when installing a Śiva, and likewise on the other appropriate bodies of non-Vedic scripture when consecrating images of the Goddess and the like, provided that his Vedic procedure needs to be supplemented, provided that the imported auxiliary does not offend the Vedic procedure in any way, and provided that he does not take the initiations (*dīkṣā*) which those scriptures require.[586] In other words it had to be conceded that a hybrid of Tantric and Vedic rituals procedures was already an institutional reality; and that this was so is confirmed by a Śaiva source, which protests against their existence, insisting that patrons should engage only initiated Śaiva officiants of full conviction, who would perform Śaiva rituals of consecration uncontaminated by such hybridization.[587]

---

[586] This position is established at length in the course of the commentary on *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.7, which lists the valid sources of knowledge of religious duty (*dharmamūlam*), namely Śruti, Smṛti, and observation of the practice of exemplary brahmins, supplemented by personal judgement and preference where the other sources of knowledge leave scope for them. Aparāditya considers at length and rejects the proposition that the scriptures of the Pāśupatas, Śaivas, Pāñcarātrikas, and others not rooted in the Veda (*vedamūla-*) should be added to the list (vol. 1, p. 10, l. 6 ff.). He concludes: *tataś ca devapūjādau narasiṃhapurāṇādiprasiddhaivetikartavyā grāhyā nānyā | evaṃ dīkṣāyām apy avagantavyam | na hi purāṇaprasiddhāyāṃ dīkṣāyāṃ jātiśodhanam asti* (vol. 1, p. 14, ll. 17–19) …*evaṃ pratiṣṭhāyām api purāṇādyuktaivetikartavyatā grāhyā nānyā teṣām eva vyāmiśradharmapramāṇatvena bhaviṣyatpurāṇe parijñātatvāt* (p. 15, ll. 1–2) 'And so the procedure for such [rituals] as the worship of deities that may be adopted is that taught in such Purāṇas as the *Narasiṃha-*, and no other. The same should be understood to apply in the case of initiation. For in the initiation established in the Purāṇas the [objectionable Śaiva] rite of the elimination of [the initiand's] caste is lacking. …Equally, in the case of rituals for the installation [of the image of a deity and the like only the procedure taught in Purāṇas and [related texts] may be adopted, since the *Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa* acknowledges none but these as sources of valid knowedge of hybrid religious duty'. By 'hybrid' (*vyāmiśra-*) Aparāditya means procedures that incorporate auxiliary elements from the Tantras. The issue of this hybrid installation rituals is taken up in detail on pp. 16, l. 1–19, l. 12.

[587] This source is the Saiddhāntika scripture *Devyāmata*. It devotes several verses to distinguishing types of Sthāpaka and to exhorting patrons to avoid all but one, who is described as learned both in the general Śaiva scriptures and in the specialized Tantras of Installation, as content with the teaching of Śiva, focused wholely upon it, strictly adhering to the discipline of the initiated (*samayācāraḥ*), without any inclination towards the scriptures of the uninitiated (*paśuśāstram*), taking no pleasure in the mundane religion, but delighting in the religion of Śiva alone: (2.16cd, 17ab, 19ab, 20ab): *ācāryaḥ śivaśāstrajñaḥ pratiṣṭhātantrapāragaḥ* || …17 *śivaśāstrārthasaṃtuṣṭaḥ samayācārapālakaḥ* | …19ab *śivaśāstraikacittātmā paśuśāstraparāṅmukhaḥ* | …20 *virakto laukike dharme śivadharmānurañjitaḥ*. Sthāpakas to be avoided are those who are Vaidika in their religious commitment and learning. Some of these have no more than a partial knowledge of the Tantras of Installation; but they should be avoided even if they mastered both the Tantras of Installation and the general Śaiva scriptures (2.7–8b and 2.13–14):

Instances of incorporation of Śaiva ritual in the Smārta domain can be adduced from most regions and periods;[588] but perhaps the most striking because it was so widely disseminated and accepted by those who considered themselves to be on the Smārta side of the divide is represented by the *Prapañcasāra* attributed to Śaṅkarācārya and the closely related *Śāradātilaka* of Lakṣmaṇadeśika. These two texts, which, I have argued, were composed in Orissa or on the basis of Orissan tradition, most probably in the twelfth century,[589] present a system of ritual that differs from the properly Tantric only in its catholic character—in Smārta fashion it includes rituals of propitiation for all the main deities—, its avoidance of all the elements of 'impure' practice that the Smārtas castigated in the Śaiva cults of Bhairava and the Goddess, and its expurgation of doctrines that were contrary to what could be found in acceptably brahmanical sources, notably the doctrine of the thirty-six levels of reality (*tattvāni*).

THE CAUSES OF THE DOMINANCE OF ŚAIVISM

Śaivism, then, was undoutedly the most successful among the religious systems that received royal patronage during the early medieval period. It was the most commonly adopted. Of the others some were absorbed by it and the rest while flourishing independently beside it came to remodel themselves along Śaiva lines.

No doubt there were many factors that led to Śaivism's rise to dominance within this complex environment, and no doubt many of these will remain invisible to us, since they could be discerned and weighed only if we had access to much more detailed evidence of the activities and motivations of individuals and institutions, both religious and political. Nonetheless, I venture a general explanation.

The Early Medieval Process

On the basis of the epigraphical record of acts of patronage, and considering evidence of changes over time within the Śaivas' prescriptive literature, I propose that the fundamental reason for the religion's success, underlying and structuring the mass of particulars now lost to view, was that it greatly increased its appeal to royal patrons by extending and adapting its repertoire to contain a body of rituals and theory that legitimated, empowered, or promoted key elements of the social, political and economic process that characterizes the early medieval period.

These elements were:

1. the spread of the monarchical model of government through the emergence of numerous new dynasties at subregional, regional, and supraregional levels;
2. the multiplication of land-owning temples, both royal temples in nuclear areas and lesser temples in peripheral zones, often established by subordinate local lords, thus promoting the rural economy and the progressive penetration of the authority of the centre into new territories;
3. the proliferation of new urban centres, both commercial centres that grew from below through a process of agglomeration, and planned settlements, growths from above, founded by rulers;
4. the expansion of the agrarian base through the creation of villages, land reclamation, and the construction of water-reservoirs, wells, and other means of irrigation, with the steady growth in population that these developments imply; and
5. the cultural and religious assimilation of the growing population of communities caught up in this expansion.[590]

At the same time it took steps to integrate itself with the brahmanical sub-

---

pratiṣṭhātantrakiñcijjñaḥ paśuśāstrānurañjitaḥ | tattvopadeśahīnaś ca nācāryo na ca sādhakaḥ || 8 tena saṃsthāpitaṃ liṅgaṃ siddhidaṃ na kadā cana | …13 padavākyapramāṇajño brāhmaṇo vedapāragaḥ | pratiṣṭhātantrakiñcijjñaḥ sthāpako na praśasyate || 2.14 pratiṣṭhātantratattvajñaḥ śivaśāstraviśāradaḥ | so 'pi na sthāpakair iṣṭaḥ paśuśāstrānurañjitaḥ.

[588] One of these, the assimilation of Śākta Śaiva propitiation rites by the Atharvavedic tradition of the Paippalādins of Orissa, has been demonstrated at length in SANDERSON 2007b.

[589] SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 230–233.

[590] For this positive characterization of the period I am indebted to the work of a number of historians who in recent decades have shown the invalidity of the widespread view that it was a time of decline, de-urbanization, fragmentation, and general impoverishment in the aftermath of a glorious classical age that culminated under the Gupta kings and ended with their demise. I acknowledge in particular the research, conclusions, and hypotheses of Noboru KARASHIMA (1984), R. CHAMPAKALAKSHMI (1986), Hermann KULKE (1990, 1995a, b), Brajadulal CHATTOPADHYAYA (1994), Upinder SINGH (1994), Burton STEIN (1994, 1998), James HEITZMAN (1995), and Cynthia TALBOT (2001). That judgement, which owes more, one suspects, to the concept of the European Dark Ages after the collapse of the Roman empire than to unbiased analysis of India's epigraphical and archaeological record, has its counterpart in the not uncommon assessment that these centuries also witnessed a progressive degeneration of Sanskritic literary, intellectual, and religious culture. It is refreshing to see that the work of those historians who are engaging vigorously with the epigraphical and archaeological evidence of the age has brought forth a view that is more consonant with the abundant literary evidence of intellectual and aesthetic vigour.

strate in ways that rendered it accessible and acceptable to a far wider constituency and therefore all the more appealing to rulers in their role as the guardians of the brahmanical social order.

Śaivism and Monarchy

Śaivism's engagement with the first and most crucial of these elements is apparent in the fact that from the seventh century onwards inscriptions and prescriptive religious texts reveal that Śaiva brahmin Gurus were holding the position of royal preceptor (*rājaguruḥ*) in numerous new kingdoms both on the Indian subcontinent and in Southeast Asia and in this capacity empowering and legitimating the monarch's rule by granting him Śaiva initiation (*śivamaṇḍaladīkṣā*). It might be thought that this would have been an unappealing step for any but the most reclusive and ineffectual of kings, since after initiation Śaivas were obliged to adhere to a complex and time-consuming program of daily and occasional rituals. However, early in the development of the Mantramārga, the Śaivas, no doubt in order to extend their recruitment and hence their influence, admitted a category of initiates who in consideration of the fact that they were incapable of taking on these onerous duties were exonerated from doing so.[591] The king was considered to qualify for this less arduous route to liberation by reason of his royal obligations. He was therefore required to adhere only to the obligations of an uninitiated devotee of Śiva taught in the texts of the *Śivadharma* corpus, which in his case were principally to support the religion and its institutions and to sponsor and appear in conspicuous ceremonies in the civic domain.

Moreover, according to prescriptive sources the king's initiation was to be followed by a Śaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony (*rājyābhiṣekaḥ*), bestowed both on the king and his chief consort, and also given to the heir apparent at the time that he was consecrated to succeed to his father's throne (*yuvarājābhiṣekaḥ*).[592]

This new ceremony was added to the purely Śaiva consecrations recognized by the core tradition, through which a Śaiva Guru empowered an initiate to take office as a Sādhaka (*sādhakābhiṣekaḥ*), a specialist in Mantra-rituals for supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*), and that through which a retiring Guru (*ācāryaḥ*) consecrated his chosen successor (*ācāryābhiṣekaḥ*), passing on to him his duties. In this way the monarch was incorporated as a third kind of Śaiva initiate, who differed from the Sādhaka and the Guru not in the character of the initiation itself but in the consecration ceremony that followed it: while they were to be consecrated for purely Śaiva functions, the king was to be consecrated to take up office as the "head of [the brahmanical social order of] the caste-classes and religious disciplines" (*varṇāśramaguruḥ*),[593] the role already assigned to him by brahmanical prescription.[594]

As the function of the Śaiva consecration is modified in this case, so its form, though in general Śaiva, incorporates distinctive non-Śaiva elements appropriate to its mundane and brahmanical aspects, such as the inclusion of the royal banners, weapons, and armour in the objects of worship,[595] the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat,[596] the

---

[591] The distinction between these two categories of initiate, those who receive initiation with post-initiatory duties (*sabījā dīkṣā* 'initiation with seed') and those who receive it without (*nirbījā dīkṣā* 'initiation without seed'), is not present in the earliest Saiddhāntika scriptures, namely the corpus of *Niśvāsa* texts found in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* codex, the earliest of which, the *Mūlasūtra*, was probably composed at some time between 450 and 550, for which dating see the conclusions of a recent workshop on this text summarized in the newsletter of the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007). On the relatively archaic character of the *Niśvāsa* corpus see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 22–31 (archaic features listed in fn. 32, pp. 29–31), and SANDERSON 2006. The category of exonerated initiates appears later in the *Kiraṇa*, the *Pārameśvara*, and the *Svacchanda*, and, following the latter, in the Paddhatis. The textual evidence is given in SANDERSON forthcoming *a*.

[592] The textual and epigraphical evidence for the practice of royal initiation, and the textual evidence for the king's exoneration from Śaiva duties, and this ancillary Śaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony are presented in SANDERSON forthcoming *a*. On the brahmanical consecrations of the king, queen, and heir apparent see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 382 and notes 115–117.

[593] *Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna* f. 74v1: [4.118] *varṇānām āśramāṇāṃ ca gurubhāvāya bhūpateḥ | yo 'bhiṣekavidhiḥ so 'pi procyate dīkṣitātmanaḥ* 'I shall also teach the rite of consecration as the means by which a king, provided that he has received [Śaiva] initiation, becomes the patron of the caste-classes and brahmanical disciplines'.

[594] *Manusmṛti* 7.35cd: *varṇānām āśramāṇāṃ ca rājā sṛṣṭo 'bhirakṣitā* 'The king has been created as the guardian of the castes and disciplines'; *Bṛhaspatismṛti* 1.9ab: *tasmād varṇāśramāṇāṃ tu netāsau nirmitaḥ purā* 'he was created of old as the leader of the castes and disciplines'; *Viṣṇusmṛti* 3.1–3: *atha rājadharmāḥ. prajāparipālanam | varṇāśramāṇāṃ sve sve dharme vyavasthāpanam* 'Next the duties of the king: protection of his subjects [and] ensuring that the castes and [followers of the] disciplines keep to their respective duties'; *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.65.55: *varṇāśramavyavasthā tu tathā kāryā viśeṣataḥ | svadharmapracyutān rājā svadharme viniyojayet* 'And his special duty is to establish the castes and disciplines. The king must force those who have fallen away from their duties [as members and followers of these] to practice them'. The characterization of the king in accordance with these injunctions as the Guru of the castes and disciplines (*varṇāśramaguruḥ*) is a commonplace in our period. See, for example, *Sātvatasaṃhitā* 24.16–17 (> *Īśvarasaṃhitā* 17.14–15); Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* 12.6.85; Candraprabhasūri, *Prabhāvakacarita* v. 284ab; Kṣemendra, *Avadānakalpalatā* 2.60c and 27.22b. See also the cognate expressions *sarvāśramaguruḥ* and *āśramiṇāṃ guruḥ* in *Netratantra* 19.87 and 20.55b, *varṇāśramadharmamaryādācāryaḥ* and *akhilāśramaguruḥ* in *Āgamaḍambara*, Act 2, prose after 20 and Act 3, v. 4, and *varṇaguruḥ* in *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 3.85ab.

---

[595] *Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna*, f. 75r4–v1 (4.129c–132): *ghaṭeṣu abhyarcya lokeśān sāstrān indrapura<ḥ>sarān* || 130 *śivam agniñ ca hetīś ca ketuṃ* (conj.: *ketuś* Cod.) *ceśādivediṣu* [Marginal glosses: *khaḍgādi* on *hetīś* and *dhvajacihnaṃ* on *ketuś*] | *saṃnidhīkṛtya saṃtarpya pūjayec cakravartinaḥ* || 131 *udagvediśira<ḥ>stheṣu kalaśeṣūktalakṣmasu* | *anantādiśikhaṇḍy*antān* (corr.: *antā* Cod.) *digvidikṣu yathākramam* || 132 *tasyās tadvad adha<ḥ>stheṣu rudramātṛgaṇārthadān* | *grahāsurapalāś*ākhyān* (conj.: *ākhya* Cod.) *bhogināṃ adhipān api* 'He should worship Indra and the other Lokapālas together with their weapons in the vases, and then Śiva, Agni, the [royal] weapons, and the [royal] banner on the altars beginning [with that] in the northeast. He should then summon, gratify, and worship the [eight] Universal Monarchs [, i.e. the Vidyeśvaras], beginning with Ananta and ending with Śikhaṇḍin, in the vases whose required characteristics have been stated above, set on the northern altar, and likewise, below that [altar], the Rudras, the Mātṛs, Kubera, the Grahas, the Asuras, the flesh-eating [Rākṣasas], and the Nāga lords'; f. 76r2–4 (4.141–142): *śivāgnihetiketūnāṃ kāritābhyām athārcanam* | *pañcagavyaṃ caruṃ tābhyāṃ dattvā ca dvijaśodhanam* || *svāpayitvā tu tau tatra sarakṣau vedikādvaye* | *pṛtha<k> prākśirasau mahyāṃ saṃyatau kṣaumaśayyayoḥ* 'He should make both [the king and queen] offer worship to Śiva, the Fire, the [royal] weapons, and the [royal] banner, and then give them the five products of the cow, rice porridge [prepared on the sacred fire], and a tooth-cleaning twig. He should then have them sleep on the ground with their heads to the east on beds of linen on the surface of the two altars, having provided them with protection (*sarakṣau*). They should observe chastity [throughout the night].' For the protection mentioned here see the rites such those of protecting the beds by reciting of the Weapon-Mantra over them and surrounding them with Weapon-empowered lines of mustard-seeds, sesame-seeds, and ash set out in *Uttarakāmika* 23.54–59 (elaborating the related expression *sarakṣān svāpayen niśi*) and *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 7.98c–103, both cited in BRUNNER 1977, pp. 216–221. As for the requirement that the king and queen should sleep with their heads to the east, this too expresses the relatively mundane nature of this consecration. For at this point in Śaiva initiation ritual candidates are to sleep with their heads to the east if they seek benefits other than liberation; see *Mṛgendra* , *Kriyāpāda* 7.99ab: *bubhokṣoḥ śayanaṃ kuryād guruḥ prācīnamastakam*.

[596] *Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna* f. 76v4–5 (4.150–152b): *hetīn astreṇa ketūṃś ca varmaṇā kaṅkaṭāny api* [Marginal gloss on *kaṅkaṭāni*: *saṃnahyāni*] | *sugandhapuṣpadhūpādyair naivedyāntaiḥ prapūjya ca* || *anantādīṃś ca *vidyeśān udagvedyāṃ* (conj.: *ved+ + + + + vedyāś* Cod.) *ca pūrvavat* | *rudrādīṃś ca ghaṭeṣu iṣṭvā vedyor ūrdhvam athāstaret* || *bṛhadukṣṇo 'tiśūrasya vṛṣadaṃśasya car[maṇī]* 'After worshipping with offerings beginning with fragrant flowers and incense and ending with cooked food the weapons and the banners with the Weapon-Mantra and the cuirasses with the Armour-Mantra, he should worship Ananta and the other *Vidyeśvaras on the northern altar (conj.) as before and after worshipping the Rudras[, the Mātṛs, Kubera, the Grahas, the Asuras, the flesh-eating (Rākṣasas),] and [the Nāga lords] he should spread on the two altars the skins of a fighting bull and a cat'. Cf. Varāhamihira *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 47.75–76, on the royal *puṣyasnānam*: *gatvā dvitīyavedīṃ samupaviśec carmaṇāṃ upari rājā* | *deyāni caiva carmāṇy upary upary evam etāni* || *vṛṣasya vṛṣadaṃśasya ruroś ca pṛṣatasya ca* | *teṣām upari siṃhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param*; and *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.21.35 on the brahmanical royal consecration (*rājyābhiṣekaḥ*): *vṛṣasya* (corr.: *vṛkasya* Ed.)

recitation of the Mantra text of sixteen verses prescribed for the brahmanical prototype when the water of consecration is poured over the king's head,[597] and, after the ceremony is complete, the king's return to his palace in full military parade, mounted on an elephant or white horse, preceded by the royal banners, and showered with parched rice by the women standing on the roofs of the mansions along his route.[598]

Just as this brahmanical rite is subsumed within the Śaiva process of initiation and consecration, so its outcome, the king's entitlement to rule as guardian of the brahmanical social order now entails the additional requirement or, one might say, compensation to the Śaivas for this descent into the mundane, that he should ensure that the authority of brahmanical prescription be subsumed within, and subordinate to, that of the Śaiva scriptures, an injunction supported by the promise that by enforcing this hierarchical relationship he will secure the stability of his rule and kingdom, implying that by neglecting to do so he will bring about their collapse.[599]

---

vṛṣadaṃśasya dvīpinaś ca bhṛgūttama | *teṣām upari siṃhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param*.

[597] *Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna* ff. 78r1–79r1 (interrupted by the loss of a folio), beginning (4.168–169): *loke vede prasiddhā<ṃ>ś ca viprān etarhi pāṭhayet* | *abhiṣekāśiṣaḥ* (corr.: *abhiṣekāsikhaḥ* Cod.) *ślokān ṛṣiproktā<ṃ>ś ca tad yathā* || *surās tvām abhiṣiñcantu ye ca siddhā<ḥ> purātanāḥ* | *brahmā viṣṇuś ca śambhuś ca śakrādyāś ca marudgaṇāḥ* || . . . . These verses are prescribed for this purpose by Varāhamihira in the first half of the sixth century in *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 47.55–70.

[598] *Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna* f. 84r2–5: *ārūḍho bhadramātaṅgam athavā vājinaṃ sitam* || *ātapatreṇa śubhreṇa hemadaṇḍena *cāruṇā* (conj.: *cā* + + Cod.) | **nigṛhītātapaḥ* (conj.: + + *hītātapaḥ* Cod.) *śvetair vījyamānaś ca *cāmaraiḥ* (em.: *cāparaiḥ* Cod.) || *cāturaṅgabalopetaḥ purataḥ ketumālayā* || *astavighno 'nukūlena dhūtayā* + + **vāyunā* (diagn. conj.: + + + Cod.) | *saudhāgravedikāsthābhiḥ kulapatnībhir ādarāt* || *prayuktaṃ lājavarṣaṃ ca manyamāno *bahupriyam* (conj.: *vahapriyam* Cod.) | *praviśet svapuraṃ *pauraiḥ* (conj.: *pau* + Cod.) + + + + *vikāsibhiḥ*.

[599] *Mohacūḍottara* f. 21v–22r (4.276–281): *śrutismṛtipurāṇāni āgamā dharmadeśakāḥ* | *etair yo vartate rājā sa rājyaṃ bhuñjate ciram* || 277 *purāṇaṃ bādhyate vedair āgamaiś ca taduktayaḥ* | *sāmānyaṃ ca viśeṣaṃ ca śaivaṃ vaiśeṣikaṃ vacaḥ* || 278 *bādhyabādhakabhāvena no vikalpyaṃ vicakṣaṇaiḥ* | *yad yathāvasthitaṃ vastu sarvajñas tat tad āvadet* || 279 *āgamānāṃ bahutve tu yatra vākyadvayaṃ bhavet* | *kiṃ pramāṇaṃ tadā grāhyaṃ pramāṇaṃ śāṅkaraṃ vacaḥ* || 280 **granthād granthāntaraṃ ṭīkā* (?) *sāpekṣanirapekṣayoḥ* | *samādhānaṃ tayoḥ kāryam arthāpattyādisādhanaiḥ* || 281 *evaṃ jñātvā surādhyakṣa nirvṛtiṃ paramāṃ vraja* | *evaṃ dharmānvite rājñi svarāṣṭre sarvadā śivam* '[The sources] that teach religious duty are the Vedas, the Dharmaśāstras, the Purāṇas, and the Āgamas. The Purāṇas are outweighed by the Vedas and the teachings of the latter by the Āgamas. The common and the special, the latter being the teachings of Śiva, are related so that the second outweighs the first. The learned should have no doubt about this. [For it is] all-knowing [Śiva that] has taught everything as it truly is. When, there being a plurality of scriptural authorities, there are two [contradictory] text-passages

The Śaivas also adapted the theory of their ritual practice to enable them to claim that those rulers who underwent their ceremonies would be empowered in their efforts to maintain their supremacy and extend it through conquest. The ceremony of initiation had been conceived as the means of obtaining liberation and was always presented in these terms in theoretical texts. But a fifteenth-century Kashmirian scholar can proclaim in a eulogy of his patriline that by receiving initiation from one of his ancestors kings had expelled their enemies and long enjoyed distinguished reigns.[600] Similarly, an inscription of the twelfth or thirteenth century from Hariyāṇa tells us that the effect of the initiation of King Sūrapāla was to give him power beyond that of all his rivals.[601] It adds that if his Guru Mūrtigaṇa initiated a brahmin, a king, or his minister he thereby made them [respectively] the repository of knowledge, the master of all the earth, and the foremost of men.[602] In the Malkāpuram inscription of A.D. 1261 we are told that the effect of the initiation given by Viśveśvaraśiva to the Kākatīya prince Rudradeva was to make the might of his [right] arm, that is to say his valour in battle, shine more brilliantly.[603] The same notion is apparent in the great Mebon inscription of A.D. 953 of the Khmer monarch Rājendravarman.

[one non-Śaiva and the other Śaiva] and the question of which is valid arises one must privilege the teaching of Śiva. The two should be reconciled, as respectively dependent and independent [in their validity], by means of implication and other exegetical tools, *[on the evidence of] the texts [themselves in which those statements occur], related texts, and commentary (?). Having understood this, Indra, achieve the highest bliss. Provided that the king adheres to religion in this manner, his kingdom will always prosper'.

[600] Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha, *Rājānakavaṃśapraśaṃsā*, v. 5ab: *tasmād yodhagurur babhūva bhagavān saṃprāpya dīkṣāṃ yataḥ | prājyaṃ rājyam apāstavairinikarāś cakruś ciraṃ bhūbhujaḥ* 'His son was the Venerable Yodha. When kings received initiation from him they drove off all their enemies and had long and outstanding reigns'. For the probable identity of these kings see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 397.

[601] *EI* I, pp. 61-66, ll. 12–13.: *tadbhaktimān mūrtigaṇo guṇīndro* (corr.: *guṇiṃdro* Ep.) *babhūva bhūpālahṛdabjasūryaḥ | saddīkṣayā yasya sa sūrapāladevo babhūvāpratimaprabhāvaḥ* 'Then there was his devotee Mūrtigaṇa, foremost of the virtuous, the sun that opened the lotus that is the heart of the king, by whose excellent initiation Sūrapāladeva became [a king] whose might was unequalled'.

[602] *Ibid.* ll. 13–14 (continuous with the passage cited in the preceding note): *... vipraṃ bhūmipatiṃ tadīyam athavāmātyaṃ sa yaṃ dīkṣayet | taṃ taṃ bodhanidhiṃ samastapṛthivīnāthaṃ pradhānaṃ nṛṇāṃ sthāṇuṃ patriṇam ātanot tarum iva śrīyājñavalkyo muniḥ* 'Any brahmin, king, or minister that he initiated he made the repository of [all] knowledge, lord of the whole earth, and the foremost of men, just as the sage Yājñavalkya caused a tree, a [mere] plant, to burst into leaf'. When the dissolute king Supriya contemptuously refused the sacred water and grain that Yājñavalkya had brought to the palace to restore his health, Yājñavalkya sprinkled them on to a rotten tree and departed. Seeing that the dead tree immediately burst into leaf the king tried without success to have him return.

[603] PANTULU 1930, v. 22: *śrīviśveśvaradeśikendraśivahastodbhāsidorvikramas*.

In a passage describing his marching forth to war it speaks of the ceremony of [Śaiva] Maṇḍala initiation as intensifying his brilliance, a statement that in the context must be taken to refer to his power to conquer his enemies.[604]

Nor was it only the theory that was adjusted to suit their patrons. According to the *Bṛhatkālottara* the Śaiva Guru was to close the initiation ceremony by giving *abhiṣekaḥ* to the horses, elephants, chariots, and soldiers of the army by sprinkling them with the water from the vase of the Weapon-Mantra (*astrakalaśaḥ*), one of the two main vases prepared in the course of the ceremony, "in order to remove all obstacles and to ensure victory in battle".[605] The Śaivas also created a double of their ritual of post-initiatory consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*) to be performed for the king before he entered the fray.[606] A much elaborated form of this 'consecration for victory' (*jayābhiṣekaḥ*), involving Śākta Śaiva rather than Śaiva Mantra-deities and one thousand vases, is taught in the 248 verses of the 27th chapter of the *Uttarabhāga* of the *Liṅgapurāṇa*.

They also offered a wealth of apotropaic, invigorative, and hostile Mantra-rites that could be performed on demand for the benefit of the realm, to promote the success of royal patrons, and to frustrate their enemies. The evidence for such rituals in the scriptural literature of the Śaivas, especially in its Śākta Śaiva texts, is pervasive.[607] There is also historical evidence of specific performances. For example, an inscription of the fifth year of the reign of the Cola Rājādhirāja II (r. 1163–1179 or 1166–1182) from the Tiruvālīśvara temple at Ārppākkam near Kāñcīpuram[608] tells us that when an army from Sri Lanka had invaded the Pāṇḍya country, plundered the treasury of the temple of Rāmeśvaram, and interrupted the cult of Śiva there, the emperor, fearing that the war might spread approached a certain Jñānaśivadeva of Gauḍa, who can be seen from his name to have been a Saiddhāntika Śaiva Guru, to free the country from this menace by ritual means. The Guru, we are told, then worshipped Śiva for this purpose for twenty-eight days continuously, and it was reported subsequently that these 'attackers of Śiva' (*śivadrohī*) had indeed been defeated. The Badāun inscription of Lakhaṇapāla praises the Rājaguru Mūrtigaṇa for his expertise in "the great rites of subjection and attraction" (l. 13: *vaśyākṛṣṭimahāvidhānanipuṇaḥ*); and Hrasvanātha, a Kashmirian Guru of the Kālīkula who also held office as the minister of peace and war under Yaśaskara (r. 939–948), performed a ritual to kill his king and other rituals to cause dissension and immobilize, presumably directed against an invading army.[609]

---

[604] The Mebon inscription (in FINOT 1925 [=K. 582], pp. 309–352), vv. 39–40: *itas tato vidyud ivādyutac chrīs tāvan nṛpāṇāṃ pracalā prakṛtyā | ramyā śarat prādur abhūn na yāvad yadīyayātrāsamayo nirabhrā || 40 tīvrāstranīrājanarājitaśrīr dīpto mahāmaṇḍaladīkṣayā yaḥ | vidyāṅgamantraiś ca kṛtātmaguptiḥ asā[dhaya]t siddhim udārabhūtim* 'The fortune of kings, [though] unstable by nature, did not flicker here and there like lightning until the charming, cloudless autumn appeared, the season of his marching forth. His splendour enhanced by the lustration of his mighty weapons, he himself [made more] brilliant by initiation before the Great Maṇḍala [of Śiva], his person protected by the Vidyāṅga Mantras, he accomplished the Siddhi of total success.'

[605] *Bṛhatkālottara* A, f. 45v2–3 (22.24c–25b): *hastyaśvaratha*yodhānāṃ* (em.: *yodhyānā* Cod.) *secanam astravāriṇā | kartavyaṃ vighnaśamanaṃ saṃgrāme jayakāraṇam* 'He should [then] consecrate the elephants, horses, and soldiers with water from the Weapon[-vase] to remove obstacles and [so] bring about [the king's] victory [in war]'.

[606] *Kiraṇa* f. 52v (27.23c–25b): *prokto 'yam abhiṣeka<ḥ> syā<d> vijayārthaṃ nṛpasya ca | 27.24 saubhāgyajananaṃ mukhyaṃ grahapīḍānivartakam | sarvasampat*pradaṃ śrīdaṃ* (corr.: *pradā śrīdā* Cod.) *yaśokīrtivivardhanam || 27.25 śāntipuṣṭikaraḥ proktaḥ seko 'yaṃ vighnanāśakaḥ* 'This consecration that I have taught may also be performed to ensure a king's victory. It is the principal means of bringing about good fortune. It removes oppression by possessing spirits. It bestows all success and wealth. It augments [the king's] fame and reputation. I have also taught it as the means of warding off ills, restoring vitality, and eliminating obstacles'; Cf. *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*: *evam anenaiva vidhinā rājyakāmasya bhraṣṭarājyasya putrakāmāyāḥ saubhāgyakāmāyā abhiṣekaṃ kuryāt* 'Following this same procedure he may perform the consecration for one who desires sovereignty, for one who has lost his kingdom, and for a woman who desires a son or good fortune'.

Just as the Guru imbued the king through the ceremonies of initiation and consecration with the numinous power of Śivahood in the exercise of his sovereignty, so the Śaiva rites by which the Guru assumed his office ensured that he, as Śiva's agent among men, was imbued with the numen of royalty. As in the brahmanical consecration of a king, in which the royal astrologer was to provide him with the royal elephant, horse, throne, parasol, fly-whisk, sword, bow, and jewels,[610] so at the time of a Guru's consecration he received from his predecessor the non-martial symbols of sovereignty (*rājāṅgāni, rājacihnāni*), such as the turban, crown, parasol, sandals, fly-whisk, elephant, horse, and palanquin.[611] To these we may add the throne supported by sculpted lions (*siṃhāsanam*) so intimately associated with kingship in the Indian tradition.[612] For a manual for royal initiation, the *Amṛteśadīkṣāvidhi*, instructs the king to reward his Guru with gifts that should include golden jewellery set with rubies and pearls, a pair of jewelled sandals, a parasol, two white chowries, an elephant, and also a golden lion-throne;[613] and the Malkāpuram inscription of A.D. 1261 describes Viśveśvaraśivācārya sitting on such a throne by virtue of his office as the Śaiva Guru of the Kākatīya king Gaṇapati of Warangal (r. 1199–1261),[614] decked out in royal splendour, "with his mass of tawny locks adorned with a diadem trembling [as he speaks], with the full-blown lotus of his face radiating blessings, with his pearl ear-rings striking the tops of his shoulders [as he moves his head from side to side], entrancing with his strings of pearls".[615]

Furthermore, according to the prescriptions of the Śaiva scriptures the residence to be built for the Guru by his royal disciple was in many respects similar in its layout to the royal palace. It included, for example, an arsenal for the storage of weapons of war.[616] That Gurus should have needed the means of warfare may surprise. But a fragmentary inscription of the late tenth century from Kadwāhā in the Guna District of Madhya Pradesh relates that when hostile forces had invaded the region and the king had been slain, the Śaiva ascetic Dharmaśiva, abbot of the Araṇipadra monastery, went into battle and routed the enemy through his skill as an archer, at the cost of his own life.[617] Nor is this an isolated instance. From the Jubbulpore stone inscription of Vimalaśiva, Rājaguru of the Kalacuri kings Jayasiṃha (r. c. 1163–1188) and Vijayasiṃha (r. c. 1188–1210), we learn that the activities of his predecessor Kīrtiśiva, Rājaguru of Narasiṃha (r. 1153–1163), extended beyond the spiritual to those of a military commander who expanded his monarch's realm and added to his own through the appropriation of temples in the territories gained.[618]

---

[607] For some examples see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 281, fn. 166.

[608] *ARE* 20 of 1899, *SII* 4:456; *ARE* 1899, §§23–38 (partial translation in §34).

[609] See SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 280–291; 2007b, pp. 295–296.

[610] *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.4.18c–20b: *tato 'bhiṣekasaṃbhārāṃs tasya kuryāt sa daivavit | kuñjaraṃ turagaṃ kuryāt tasya rājñaḥ parīkṣitau | bhadrāsanaṃ ca chattraṃ ca vālavyajanam eva ca | khaḍgaratnaṃ tathā cāpaṃ ratnāni vividhāni ca.*

[611] Bhojadeva, *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* f. 41v (< *Svacchandatantra* 4.470): *uṣṇīṣamakuṭacchatrapādukācāmarahastyaśvaśibikādirājāṅgāni ... dattvā. Svacchandatantra* 4.70b has a throne or seat (*chatraṃ pādukam āsanam*) where Bhojadeva has a fly-whisk, but his account agrees with that of the *Svacchandatantra* as transmitted in Nepalese and Grantha manuscripts. Thus NAK MS 1-224, f. 48r3: *uṣṇīṣamakuṭādyāṃś ca cchatrapādukacāmaraḥ | hastyaśvaśibikādyāṃś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ*; and IFI T. 1032, p. 96: *uṣṇīṣamakuṭādyāṃś ca chatracāmarapādukāḥ | hastyaśvaśibikādyāṃś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ.* In *Liṅgapurāṇa, Uttarabhāga*, 27.259–261 the attributes of kings (*nṛpacihnāni*) are "the conch, the fly-whisk, the drum etc., a moon-white parasol, a palanquin, and the war-banner" (*śaṅkhacāmarabheryādyaṃ chattraṃ candrasamaprabham | śibikāṃ vaijayantīṃ ca sādhayen nṛpateḥ śubhām | rājyābhiṣekayuktāya kṣatriyāyeśvarāya vā | nṛpacihnāni nānyeṣāṃ kṣatriyāṇāṃ vidhīyate*).

[612] For an image of such a throne see, e.g., the eighth-century metal Tārā from Sirpur (Śrīpura) in HUNTINGTON 1985, plate 30. The notion that the throne is the very embodiment of sovereignty and imparts its power to the enthroned is already found in the Vedic literature, in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* (12.8.3.4) (GONDA 1966: 45–46): *āsandyām abhiṣiñcati | āsandī sad vai sāṃrājyaṃ sāmrājyenaivainaṃ sāmrājyaṃ gamayati* 'He consecrates him by affusion on the throne. The throne is indeed true sovereignty. Through [this] sovereignty he causes him to achieve sovereignty'.

[613] *Amṛteśadīkṣāvidhi* f. 16v2–3: 37 *paścād gurur dakṣaṇīyaḥ svarṇabhāraiḥ *suvistaraiḥ* (em. : *suviṣṭaraiḥ* Cod.) | *māṇikyamuktākhacitair alaṅkāraiś ca adbhutaiḥ* | 38 *navaratnamayair dāntais tathā vai ratnapāduke | haimaṃ siṃhāsanaṃ chattraṃ dattvā vai cāmare śubhe* | 39 *maṇimuktāśvanāgendra-uṣṭrameṣagavādibhiḥ | kṣetragrāmādiviṣayair maṇḍalaiś ca śubhair varaiḥ* 'After that the Guru should be rewarded with extremely large quantities of gold, with marvellous jewellery set with rubies and pearls, made of the nine jewels, and of ivory, and, having given him a pair of jewelled sandals, a golden lion-throne, two white chowries, with jewels, pearls, horse, elephants, camels, rams, cows and the like, fields, villages and the like, districts, and fine provinces.'

[614] PANTULU 1930, v. 38d: *tasmin gaṇapatyadhīśagurutāsiṃhāsanādhyāsini śrīviśveśvaradeśike* 'While the Guru Viśveśvara[śiva], occupies the lion-throne of his office as Guru of King Gaṇapati'. Note also the reading *chatrapādukam āsanam* 'parasol, sandals, and throne' in the Kashmirian text of *Svacchandatantra* 4.470.

[615] PANTULU 1930, v. 39: *tvaṅgatpiṅgajaṭākirīṭam udayasmerāravindānanaṃ muktākuṇḍalatāḍitāṃsaśikharaṃ hārair manohāriṇam | vidyāmaṇḍapavartinaṃ gaṇapatikṣmāpāladīkṣāguruṃ śrīviśveśvaraśambhum īkṣitavatāṃ te cakṣuṣī cakṣuṣī.*

[616] *Mayasaṃgraha* 5.182ab: *dhanuḥkhaḍgaśarādīni vidadhyāt tu gṛhakṣate;*

Piṅgalāmata f. 71r1–2 (10.28c–31): *gṛhakṣate gṛhaṃ caiva śastrasaṃsthāpanāya tu | khaḍgabāṇadhanuś caiva kuṭhāro mudgaras tathā | cchurikā kuntadaṃtaś ca citradaṇḍas tathaiva ca | lakuṭaṃ śakti pāśaś ca kaṇayaḥ śūlapatrakaḥ | cakrāsi gadavajraś ca aṅkuśaś ca kupaṭṭiśaḥ | evamādyāni cāstrāṇi pharāṇi vividhāni ca | sthāpitavyāni deveśe gṛhe gṛhakṣatasya tu.* The term *gṛhakṣataḥ* here denotes [the deity of] a segment immediately to the east of its centre of the southern edge of the square plan. In the last verse I take *phara-* to be a variant of *sphara-* 'shield' from Iranian (Old Persian *spara-barai* 'shield-bearer'; Persian *ispar* 'shield').

[617] *EI* 37:20, ll. 10–16. The inscription is fragmentary, but this much of its meaning is clear: while the ascetic Dharmaśiva was in the monastery at Araṇipada (elsewhere called Araṇipadra) performing austerities (*tenāraṇipadaṃ nāma kṛtaṃ padam aninditaṃ . . . dattvāraṇipade . . . tasya dharmaśiva ity abhavaj jitātmā śiṣyaḥ . . . tasyāśrame vardhayatas tapāṃsi* [ll. 10–12]) a ruler called Gobhaṭa came there with a force of elephants (*tatrājagāmonmadasindhurāṇāṃ balena bhūpaḥ kila gobhaṭākhyaḥ* [l. 12]). Someone, perhaps the local ruler, was killed by this king (*[nṛ]peṇa parāgatāsuḥ sahasā papāta* [ll. 12–13]); and he, evidently Dharmaśiva, wept with compassion for a while when he heard the news (*tasyāvagamya sa kathāṃ karuṇāvimuktabāṣpaḥ kṣaṇaṃ* [l. 13]), then, flying into a rage (*tad anu kopavipāṭa[lākṣaḥ]* [l. 13]), went into battle, a veritable Śiva on earth, armed with a bow *that had come [down to him] from Prabhāva[śiva?] (?) (*atha prabhāvāgatakārmukeṇa bāṇaiś ca dīptaḥ sa dharāvṛṣāṅkaḥ* [l. 14]), and, like Śiva in his Tripurāntaka embodiment, routed the whole army of the enemy before ascending to the incomparable world [above] in a shower of flowers scattered by Indra's celestial nymphs (*ātta[sva]līlas tripurāntakasya . . . sakalam api sa jitvā śātravaṃ śarvakalpaḥ | surapatiramaṇīnāṃ puṣpavṛṣṭyāvakīrṇaḥ puram anupam[aṃ] . . .* [l. 15]). The poet refers here to the reward conventionally attributed to a warrior who dies bravely when fighting to protect his country; see, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 8, supplementary passage 14, ll. 31–34; 13, supplementary passage 15, ll.1358–1361.

[618] *EI* 25:33 (A.D. 1174), vv. 23–24: *na syandanaṃ vasumatī na ca candrasūryau cakre na sārathir abhūt sa ca viśyayoniḥ | neṣur hariḥ parapurāṇi tathāpi bhasma cakre yataḥ sa iti kīrtiśivaḥ sphuṭaṃ saḥ || yaśobhir induviśadais tathaivārivikarṣitaiḥ | apūpurat sa sarvāśā vivekakusumair iva* 'He was manifestly [worthy of the name] Kīrtiśiva [Temple/Fame-Śiva]. For he [was a Śiva in as much as he] reduced the cities of his enemies to ashes [just as Śiva did to the cities of the three demons] even though his war chariot [unlike Śiva's] was not the earth, the sun and moon were not its two wheels, its driver was not Brahmā, and his arrow was not Viṣṇu; and he filled all the directions with the moon-white temples that he had wrested from his

Kings rewarded their Gurus with the donation or construction of monasteries (*maṭhaḥ*) and with grants of revenue from designated lands with which they themselves constructed and endowed such institutions. Thus in the first half of the ninth century the Rājaguru Purandara founded two monasteries in Gwalior, one at Mattamayūra and a second at Araṇipadra, using the funds he had received from king Avantivarman as the *dakṣiṇā* for performing the king's Śaiva initiation, for which purpose he had been persuaded to move to Mattamayūra, probably from Mālava. The wealth received is described in the inscription that records these events as "[the revenue of] the most valuable portion of his kingdom".[619] Similarly, when the Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva

---

foes, just as he did with the [white] blossoms of his *Vivekas*'. My translation finds a reference to [lost] works by Kīrtiśiva entitled *Viveka*, presumably commentaries on Śaiva texts. It is possible that the poet refers not to works but to Kīrtiśiva's spiritual insights (*vivekāḥ*).

[619] Ranod inscription, *EI* 1:41, vv. 10–15: *tasmāt purandaragurur guruvad garimṇaḥ prajñātirekajanitasya babhūva bhūmiḥ | yasyādhunāpi vibudhair itikṛtyaśaṃsi vyāhanyate na vacanaṃ nayamārgavidbhiḥ || 11 vandyaḥ ko 'pi cakāsty acintyamahimā tulyaṃ munir bhāsvatā rājann uttamaśabdapūrvaśikharābhyarṇam prakīrṇadyutiḥ | dīkṣārthīti vaco niśamya sukṛtī cāroktam urvīpatir yasyehānayanāya yatnam akaroc chrīmān avantiḥ purā || 12 gatvā tapasyantam upendrapūrve pure tadā śrīmadavantivarmā | bhṛśaṃ samārādhya tam ātmabhūmiṃ kathaṃcid ānīya cakāra pūtām || 13 athopasadyāpya ca samyag aiśīṃ dīkṣāṃ sa dakṣo gurudakṣiṇārtham | nivedya yasmai nijarājyasāraṃ svajanmasāphalyam avāpa bhūpaḥ || 14 sa kārayām āsa samṛddhibhājaṃ munir maṭhaṃ sanmuniratnabhūmim | prasiddham āvāridhi merukalpaṃ śrīmatpure mattamayūranāmni || 15 punar dvitīyaṃ svayam advitīyo guṇair munīndro 'raṇipadrasaṃjñam | tapovanaṃ śreṣṭhamaṭhaṃ vidhāya preṣṭhaḥ pratiṣṭhāṃ paramāṃ nināya* 'Then came the Guru Purandara, who as befitted a Guru had the gravity that comes from the highest wisdom, whose teachings concerning the duties [of Śaiva initiates] have still not been surpassed by scholars learned in the way of discipline, whom the glorious and virtuous king Avanti[varman] made efforts to bring to this land because he desired to receive [Śaiva] initiation and had heard from one of his agents that there was a certain holy ascetic in the vicinity of Uttamaśikhara shining in unimaginable glory, shedding his radiance like the sun. Avantivarman then went to [Purandara], who was practising austerities in Upendrapura, and having striven to win his favour succeeded in bringing him back to sanctify his kingdom. Then, having served him with devotion he duly received Śaiva initiation [from him]. The wise king then presented him with the best part of the wealth of his kingdom as Guru's fee and so brought his human birth to fulfilment. In the splendid town of Mattamayūra the sage then caused a richly endowed Meru-like monastery to be built, a treasury of jewel-like ascetics, the fame of which has reached [throughout the continent] to the oceans. This foremost of sages, himself unmatched in his virtues, built and richly endowed a second and most splendid monastery, [this] hermitage of Araṇipadra'. I say that Purandara probably came from Mālava because we are told here that before he was brought to Mattamayūra he was in Upendrapura and a grant of 1110 issued by the Paramāra king Naravarman (*EI* 20:11) refers to the gifting of land in a village in the district of Upendrapura (l. 5: *upendrapuramaṇḍale*), which must have been within his kingdom, that is to say, in Mālava. It is probable that this town and

I *alias* Keyūravarṣa (r.c. 915–945) induced Purandara's spiritual descendant Prabhāvaśiva (/Sadbhāvaśiva) to move to his kingdom in Chattisgarh, he founded for him at huge expense the great monastery at Golagī,[620] granting him by royal charter numerous villages and a whole well-populated town, which, since it is not named, was probably Golagī itself,[621] or, according to the account of the Malkāpuram inscription, gave him a vast reward which that ascetic, after he had himself founded the monastery, transferred to it as its endowment.[622] In the next generation the Kalacuri Lakṣmaṇarāja II (r.c. 945–970) brought in Hṛdayaśiva and gave him the monasteries attached to the temples of Vaidyanātha and Nohaleśvara, the second of which Hṛdayaśiva passed on to his disciple Aghoraśiva;[623] and the Bāṇgarh Praśasti reports, as we have seen, that

---

district bore the name of Upendra, the first of the Paramāra kings according to the genealogy given by the poet Padmagupta in 11.76 of his *Navasāhasāṅkacarita*.

[620] In all secondary sources, including SANDERSON 2007a (p.274), the name of this monastery (*maṭhaḥ*) appears as Golakī-. That spelling is well attested, but only in manuscripts and inscriptions from the Dravidian South, where the scribes, speaking languages in which voiced and unvoiced consonants are not distinguished, are liable to substitute *k* for *g*. We also find *kolakī* there. I now correct to Golagī- because this is what I find in the earliest testimony, which comes from regions whose vernacular languages do distinguish these consonants, namely Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts of the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* and the Bāṇgarh Praśasti of the time of Nayapāla (r.c. 1027–1043) (SIRCAR 1983b, v.6: *golagyās sa mahāmaṭhaḥ*). The name appears as Golaggī in the Chandrehe inscription (*caraṇapūtagolaggikaḥ*). I identify Golagī with modern Gurgi (244° 31′ N, 81° 27′ E), about 12 miles due east of Rewa Town, in the north of the Kalacuri kingdom. This is the site of once vast Śaiva ruins (CUNNINGHAM 1885, pp.149–154; MEYER *et al.* 1908-1931, vol.21, pp.282–283; BANERJI 1931, pp.41–45). A full account of my reasons for proposing this location and for rejecting as groundless the widespread view that the monastery was in the south of the kingdom at Bheṛāghāṭ on the Narmadā river, close to the Kalacuri capital Tripurī, must be set out elsewhere.

[621] Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, v.5: *tato madhumatīpateḥ kṛtamahātapaḥsaṃcayaḥ prabhāvaśiva ity abhūt sakalaśaivacūḍāmaṇiḥ | anekanṛpavanditaḥ sa yuvarājadevena yas tapodhanapatiḥ kṛtaś caraṇapūta*golaggikaḥ* (my reading : *golagnikaḥ* MIRASHI, BANERJI [*EI* 21:23]) 'Then after the abbot of Madhumatī came that crest-jewel of all the Śaivas called Prabhāvaśiva, who had accumulated vast power through his asceticism and was revered by many kings. He purified Golaggī [=Golagī] with his feet after being appointed by Yuvarājadeva as overlord of the ascetics [of the monastery at that place]'; and the Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, vv.6–7: *tasyākhilakṣitipatipraṇatottamāṅgacūḍāmaṇidyuticayārcitapādapīṭhaḥ | śiṣyo babhūva bhuvanatrayakīrtanīyaḥ śrīmatprabhāvaśivanāmamunir manīṣī || ānīya yaṃ sahajavāsanayā nayajñaḥ śrīmugdhatuṅgatanayo yuvarājadevaḥ | sattvopakārabhavaduttamakīrtihetor agrāhayan maṭham anantadhanapratiṣṭham* 'His disciple was the glorious and learned ascetic Prabhāvaśiva, worthy of celebration throughout the three worlds, the pedestal beneath whose feet was honoured by the dense rays of the crest-jewels on the heads of all the kings who prostrated themselves before him. Yuvarājadeva, the son of Mugdhatuṅga, skilled in policy, brought [him to his kingdom prompted] by an inborn predisposition and had him accept a monastery that he established [for him] with infinite wealth'. The damaged vv.35–40 at the end of this inscription list the places that the king made over to Prabhāvaśiva: *[sthānaṃ] . - . . . . - . ya kīrtanī[yaṃ] puṇyānvitāya munaye svayam arcitāya | - - nam ullikhita[śāsana - . - - keyū]avarṣanṛpatiḥ [svayam ājahāra] || 36 pakk + + . - - [taṃ?] tathā sārasaḍollakam | vakkaḍollakarajyauddheko + +[nā]sapuṇḍikā || 37 + + + + . - - + + + puraṃ khaṭollikā | . nakalābhīrapallī + + + + sarasvatī || 38 [eteṣāṃ] dvādaśakañ ca kavacakṣetram eva ca | sāmantapāṭakaś caiva vaṭa + + . - . + || 39 + + + yā[tallapaṭī] śāsanaṃ [sa]tram ity api | sa + + bhaddhaci[ū]rā [kusu?]mvā ca ku[kku]ḍiyā || 40 rajogrāmānvitā[n etān śā]sanatvena dattavā[n] | + + + + . [siddhā]ntapāragāya garīyase || puraṃ paurajanākīrṇaṃ + + + + samastakam | bhaktyā samarpayām āsa śāsanatve[na bhū]patiḥ.*

[622] PANTULU 1930, vv.25c–26: *tasmai niḥspṛhacetase galacurikṣmāpālacūḍāmaṇir grāmāṇāṃ yuvarājadevanṛpatir bhikṣāṃ trilakṣīṃ dadau || 26 kṛtvā sa śaivamunir adbhutaśīlamūrtiḥ śrīgolakīmaṭham udāram udāttacittaḥ | [ta]syākarasya nṛpadeśikamauktikānāṃ vṛttiṃ cakāra sakalām api tāṃ trilakṣīm* 'To that [ascetic] whose mind was free of all craving the king Yuvarājadeva, that crest-jewel among the Kalacuri monarchs, gave a 300,000 endowment of villages. That Śaiva ascetic, the noble-minded embodiment of extraordinary good conduct, built the great Golakī [Golagī] monastery [there] and then made over the whole of that 300,000 living to that [monastery, which, ocean-like, has become] the source of [many] pearls in the form of Rājagurus'. MIRASHI (*CII* 4i, p.clviii) interprets the words *grāmāṇāṃ bhikṣāṃ trilakṣīṃ* 'a 300,000 endowment of villages' to mean that 300,000 villages were given to Prabhāvaśiva and points out that if the report is correct it indicates that "the king assigned to him one third of the total revenue of his home province of Ḍāhala, which, according to tradition, comprised nine lakhs of villages". This would indeed be a vast endowment, so vast indeed that I find it hard to accept his interpretation. The Gurgi inscription mentions only about twenty villages and a town and the Malkāpuram inscription need mean only that the endowment [consisting of the revenue capacity of these places] was valued at 300,000 of some unspecified monetary unit. This alternative was already considered by PANTULU, the first editor of the Malkāpuram inscription. For though he proposed the interpretation later adopted by MIRASHI, he saw the difficulty it entails (1930, p.52): "The founder of the monastery was one Sadbhāva Śambhu who obtained a gift of three lacks [*sic*] of villages (or was it a villages [*sic*] fetching an income of *Nishkas* (coins)?) from the Kalachuri king Yuvarājadeva and gave away those villages to the Maṭha as an endowment". In favour of this more realistic reading is a parallel expression seen in an inscription of the sixth century from a site near Mrohaung in Arakan. There we learn of the gift to a Buddhist monastery of a *trisāhasriko grāmaḥ* (*EI* 37:13, l.13: *deṅguttanāmā ttrisāhasriko grāmo nisṛṣṭo*), which can only mean 'a village which has [a revenue yield of] 3000'. As the editor, D.C. SIRCAR points out (p.63), this refers "apparently to the revenue income in the standard coin".

[623] Bilhāri inscription, *EI* 1:31, vv.56–58: 56 *kiṃ stūyate 'sau munipuṅgavo 'thavā śrīcedicandro nṛpatiḥ kṛtādaraḥ | sadvṛttadūtaprahitair upāyanaiḥ pradarśya bhaktiṃ vidhinānināya yam || 57 śrīmallakṣmaṇarājo 'pi tasmai sutapase svayam | maṭhaṃ śrīvaidyanāthasya bhaktiyuktaḥ samārpayat || 58 svīkṛtyāpi munir bhūyo maṭhaṃ śrīnauhaleśvaram | aghoraśivaśiṣyasya sādhuvṛttasya dattavān* 'Or rather why should I praise that foremost among ascetics? [It suffices to report that] king Lakṣmaṇarāja, the moon of the Cedi dynasty, brought him [to his kingdom] after earnestly showing his devotion to him through presents sent by virtuous envoys, and then out of his devotion freely bestowed on that [saint] of great austerity the monastery of Vaidyanātha. The ascetic also accepted the monastery of Nohaleśvara and then gave it to his virtuous disciple Aghoraśiva'.

the Pāla emperor Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027) bestowed a lofty gilded monastery on the Guru Indraśiva at Śivavāṭī near Koṭivarṣa.[624]

Moreover, we have several records of Gurus using their resources independently to establish further monasteries. Thus Prabhāvaśiva's disciple Praśāntaśiva built a monastery at Chandrehe for ascetics devoted to meditation[625] and a hermitage on the banks of the Ganges at Benares.[626] His disciple, the Rājaguru Prabodhaśiva, also built a monastery at Chandrehe;[627] Pataṅgaśiva, a spiritual descendant of Purandara through another line, built a monastery in Gwalior at a site now unknown;[628] and the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśiva, after receiving a village in Andhra from the Kākatīya Queen Rudradevī, built a monastery there and renamed the village Viśveśvaragolakī after both himself and the original home of his preceptorial lineage in Chattisgarh, dictating that only a Guru of this lineage, one consecrated by another Guru of the same (*golakīvaṃśyakṛtābhiṣekaḥ*), should be allowed to preside over his foundation.[629] According to the same source he also established monasteries in Kālīśvarapura, Mandrakūṭanagara (v. 82), and Īśvarapura (v. 85), no doubt under the same conditions.

In this way there developed a far-reaching network of interconnected seats of Saiddhāntika Śaiva learning. Figures at the summit of this clerical hierarchy thus came to exercize a transregional authority whose geographical extent could be greater than that of any contemporary king. Viśveśvaraśiva while holding office as the Rājaguru of the Kākatīya Gaṇapati is said also to have been the Guru of the Kalacuri king, the Cola king, and the king of Mālava;[630] and praise of Śaiva

---

[624] Bāṇgarh inscription, SIRCAR 1983b, v. 9: *śrīmān indraśivaḥ sphuṭaṃ hariharaprāyāṃ śivendrākṛtim bibhrad vaṃśavibhūṣaṇaṃ samabhavac chiṣyo 'sya puṇyātmanaḥ | yasmai kāñcanapuñjamañjuracitaprāsādameruspphuratkailāsābhamaṭhaṃ dadāv iha mahīpālo nṛpas tattvavit* 'The disciple of that [Guru] devoted to piety was the illustrious Indraśiva, an ornament of his lineage, who did indeed have an appearance [matching his name, in that it was one] that embodied both Śiva and Indra [=Upendra, i.e. Viṣṇu] as though it were an image of Harihara [in which Śiva is both himself and Viṣṇu in a single body]. To him king Mahīpāla, [once he had become through initiation] a knower of [ultimate] reality, gave in this place a monastery that resembled Mt. Kailāsa, radiant with its Meru-like towers beautifully wrought with much gold'.

[625] Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, vv. 6a, 7: *praśāntaśivacandramās tad anu tasya śiṣyo 'bhavat ...7 sa śoṇanadasaṃgame bhramaraśailamūle 'tulaṃ priyālavanasaṃkule phalamṛṇālakandāśanaḥ | cakāra viditaṃ janair munisakhaḥ praśāntāśramaṃ svapādapadapaṅktibhiḥ pavitabhūtalo yaḥ kṛtī* 'The successor of [Prabhāvaśiva] was his disciple, the moon-like Praśāntaśiva. ... Eating [nothing but] fruits, lotus stems, and bulbs, that wise friend of ascetics built the famous hermitage with his name [the Praśāntāśrama] at the foot, thick with a forest of Priyāla trees, of the Bhramara hill, at the confluence of the river Son, purifying the earth with the lines of his foot-prints'; and the Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, vv. 8 and 13: *tasyāmalena tapasā ca vivardhamānavidyābalena ca samastajagatpratītaḥ | śiṣyaḥ prakāmakamanīyaguṇaikadhāma śrīmatpraśāntaśivanāmamunir babhūva || ...13 dāhottīrṇasuvarṇadānaśamitadravyārthisārthaspṛhaḥ siddhasthānam acīkarat tad aparaṃ yaḥ śoṇatīropari | yasmin yogajuṣaḥ praviśya niyamadhvastāntarāyādhayaḥ śāntāḥ siddhasamādhayo 'cchamatayo gacchanti mukteḥ padam* 'The disciple of this [Prabhāvaśiva] was the ascetic Praśāntaśiva, who was known to all for his unblemished austerity and the power of his ever growing knowledge, the unique abode of the most desirable of qualities. ... [13:] He, who quenched the desire of a multitude of people in need of funds with fire-refined gold, built another [monastery as] a seat of Siddhas on the bank of the river Son, where masters of Yoga enter, abolish the torment of [all] hindrances through their ascetic restraint, and, when they are at peace, having achieved perfect concentration, reach with pure awareness the goal of liberation'.

[626] Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, v. 14: *tīrthasnānaniṣevanodyatadhiyām atyantaviśrāntaye yas tat kāritavān muniḥ surasarittīre tapaḥsthānakam | yat saṃsevya maheśvarārcanaratā vārāṇasīvāsino manyante bhavasāgaraṃ gurum api kṣīṇaṃ yathā [goṣpa]dam* 'That ascetic had a hermitage built on the bank of the Ganges for the complete repose of those whose minds were devoted to the practice of bathing at its Tīrthas. By resorting to it those living in Benares who are devoted to the worship of Śiva consider the ocean of transmigratory existence, vast though it is, to have dwindled into a mere puddle'.

[627] Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, v. 16ab: *gurukṛtasurāgārād ārād amuṃ maṭham unnataṃ svakam iva yaśaḥ śubhrābhrābhaṃ viśālam acīkarat* 'Near the temple built by his teacher he built this broad and lofty monastery that resembles a white cloud, as though it were his own fame'.

[628] Gwalior Museum inscription, MIRASHI 1962, v. 40: *maṭhaṃ devakulaṃ kūpās taḍāgānāṃ ca pañcakam | prā[kā]ro vāṭikā* ...'A monastery, a temple, wells, five reservoirs, a circumvallation, *an orchard (?) ....

[629] Malkāpuram inscription, PANTULU 1930, vv. 42–45 and v. 70: 69c–72: *devasya sattrasya maṭhasya tasya grāmasya sarvasya ca so 'dhikārī || 70 yo goḷakīvaṃśyakṛtābhiṣekaḥ śāntaḥ śuciḥ śaivarahasyavedī | śaivāgamānām api pāragamī saṃtānapālaḥ samaloṣṭahemā || 71 sarvāṇi bhūtāny anukampamānaḥ samastavidyāsu kṛtāvagāhaḥ | mahīsuraḥ śīlavatāṃ purogo bhavettarāṃ naiṣṭhikadeśikendraḥ | 72 viśveśvaraśivācāryo dhīmān rājaguruḥ svayam evam ājñāpayad dhīraḥ śaivācāryaśatair vṛtaḥ* 'Surrounded by hundreds of Śaivācāryas the learned and noble Viśveśvaśivācārya personally ordered that the superintendent of the [temple of the] god [Viśveśvara], the refectory, the monastery, and the whole settlement [that he had established] could only be an ascetic Guru whose consecration [to office] had been performed by [a Guru] of the lineage of Golagī, a brahmin outstanding among the virtuous, tranquil, honest, one who understands the esoteric doctrines taught by Śiva, who has mastered the Śaiva scriptures, a guardian of his initiatory line, for whom a clod of earth and gold are of equal value, compassionate to all living beings, and deeply versed in all branches of learning'.

[630] Malkāpuram inscription, PANTULU 1930, v. 38: *śrīcoleśvaramālavakṣitipatī rājanyacūḍāmaṇī yacchiṣyau kim ataḥ paraṃ gaṇapatikṣoṇīpatir yatsutaḥ | na syāt kasya mude sa deśikavaraḥ śaivāgamāmbhonidhiḥ śrīviśveśvaradeśikaḥ kalacurikṣmāpāladīkṣāguruḥ* 'The Cola king and the king of Mālava, the crest-jewels among rulers, were his disciples. King Gaṇapati too was his [spiritual] son. Whom does this excellent Guru not delight? The Guru Viśveśvara, this ocean of [knowledge of] the Śaiva scriptures, was the Guru that [also] initiated the Kalacuri king'.

Gurus as venerated by a plurality of kings is common, even a commonplace.[631]

The wealth accumulated by these Gurus enabled them behave like royal patrons themselves, not only founding new monasteries but also bestowing land-grants on brahmins, rewarding poets, founding temples and new settlements, and providing the means of irrigation. The Badāun inscription reports that the Rājaguru Mūrtigaṇa "honoured brahmins in abundance with many gifts of land that he had received due to the devotion of his royal disciple";[632] the Malkāpuram inscription says concerning the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśiva, a native of Gauḍa in eastern India: "Who can count the Gauḍa [brahmins] whose wishes he has granted, the ascetics who have received rich endowments [from him], the leading poets who have been delighted [with the rewards he has bestowed]?";[633] and the Bāṅgarh Praśasti relates that Sarvaśiva, the Rājaguru of the Pāla Nayapāla, gave [to brahmins] all the Great Gifts (*mahādānāni*) of the Purāṇic tradition, including the *tulāpuruṣadānam* in which the donor gives away his weight in gold, an activity that increasingly became emblematic of exemplary kings during the second half of the first millenium.[634] His brother Mūrtiśiva, to

---

[631] See, for example, in the colophonic verses of the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva, concerning his Guru Īśvaraśiva (see SANDERSON 2001, p. 3): *āsīt tatsaṃtatau muniḥ śrī-īśvaraśiva iti | jagatīpatibhir nṛpaiḥ pūjitapādapaṅkajaḥ*; Chandrehe inscription (*CII* 4i:44), v. 4b, concerning Purandara: *yatra purandaraḥ kṛtatapā jajñe gurur bhūbhujām*; v. 5c, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: *anekanṛpavanditaḥ*; Bilhāri inscription (*CII* 4i:45), v. 50b, concerning Dharmaśiva: *bhūpālamaulimaṇikāntibhir arcitāṅghriḥ*; v. 51bcd, concerning Sadāśiva: *nṛpaiḥ | yatpādadvayaṃ vandyam arcitaṃ śekharāṃśubhiḥ*; v. 54cd, concerning Hṛdayaśiva: *nṛpamukuṭaniviṣṭair yasya māṇikyacakrair akṛt- caraṇamūlaṃ kāntam ekāntavandyam*; Gurgi inscription (*CII* 4i:46), v. 6, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: *tasyākhilakṣitipatipraṇatottamāṅgacūḍāmaṇidyuticayārcitapādapīṭhaḥ | śiṣyo babhūva bhuvanatrayakīrtanīyaḥ śrīmatprabhāvaśivanāmamunir manīṣī*; and v. 17cd, concerning Īśānaśiva: *śrīśānaśambhur akhilāvanipālamaulimālāmaṇidyutipiśaṅgitapādapadmaḥ*.

[632] Badāun inscription, *EI* 1:10, l. 15: *svaśiṣyavarabhūpālabhaktilabdhena bhūriṇā | bhūmidānena yo viprān pūjayām āsa bhūriṇā*.

[633] PANTULU 1930, v. 39ab: *gauḍāḥ pūrṇamanorathāḥ kati kati prāptaśriyas tāpasāḥ saṃtuṣṭāḥ kavipuṃgavāḥ kati kati pradhvastapāśā nṛpāḥ*.

[634] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 11. The inscription lists *pṛthivīdānam*, *merudānam*, *viśvacakradānam*, *[sapta]sāgaradānam*, *brahmāṇḍadānam*, *kalpavṛkṣadānam*, *[hiraṇya]kāmadhenudānam*, *bhavanadānam*, *grāmadānam*, *godānam*, *parvatānāṃ dānam* (the ten *parvatadānāni* of the *Matsyapurāṇa*, with Meru in the centre), *sakalpadrumabhadraghaṭadānam*, *hiraṇyāśva[ratha]dānam*, *hiraṇyahasti[ratha]dānam*, *hiraṇyagarbhadānam*, *aśvadānam*, *tulāpuruṣadānam*, and *śrīnandīśvaradānam*. For an exhaustive presentation of the prescriptions of the Purāṇic and other sources on the "Great Gifts" see especially the fifth *Adhyāya* of the *Dānakhaṇḍa* of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* of Hemādri, written while he was a minister of Mahādeva, the Yādava king of Devagiri (r. c. 1260–1270). The *śrīnandīśvaradānam* mentioned in this inscription is, I presume, the gift of a golden image of Nandikeśvara that is to accompany the gift of a thousand cows (*Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, vol. 1, p. 253). On

whom he handed over his office as Rājaguru is likewise praised in that inscription for his abundant donations to brahmins.[635] Sarvaśiva's disciple Rūpaśiva is also praised there for his generosity to supplicants,[636] as is Īśānaśiva, the disciple of Praśāntaśiva, in the Gurgi inscription.[637] The predecessors of the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva receive similar praise for their pious largesse in that Guru's Jubbulpore inscription, and Vimalaśiva himself is commended there for the support he gave to the brahmanical order by bestowing gifts on brahmins, and adorning the land with gardens, water-tanks, charitable feeding-houses (*sattrāṇi*), temples, and houses for brahmins.[638] In the Bāṇgarh Praśasti Vidyāśiva and Dharmaśiva are

---

the drift away during our period from the sponsoring of Vedic (Śrauta) sacrifices to the bestowing of the Great Gifts such as the *tulāpuruṣadānam* see DIRKS 1976.

[635] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 15cd: *bhrātā mūrtiśivaḥ sa mānyamahimo dānāmbusekair jagat pūtaṃ yaḥ kṛtavān* … 'His brother Mūrtiśiva, of venerable glory, washed the world clean with the water he poured when making donations'. The poet refers to the rite of pouring water on to the hand of the brahmin recipient, or, in his absence, on to the ground, that must accompany any formal act of donation (*Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, vol. 1, p. 92); and by saying that he cleansed the world with these libations he suggests that his donations to brahmins were frequent, widespread, and very numerous.

[636] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 28: *śiṣyaḥ sarvaśivasya dīptatapasaḥ sarvārthicintāmaṇir* … | *śrīmān rūpaśivo babhūva* 'The disciple who succeeded Sarvaśiva, [that Guru] of blazing ascetic power, was the illustrious Rūpaśiva, who was a wishing-granting jewel for all supplicants'.

[637] *EI* 22:21, v. 18ab: …[*sarvārthi*]*nāṃ yena śrīr gamitopabhogapadavīṃ daurgatyaduḥkhacchidā* 'He caused [his] wealth to be enjoyed by all supplicants, thus ending the torment of their poverty'.

[638] *EI* 25:33. The inscription precedes its account of the life of Vimalaśiva with some information about the predecessors in his Guru lineage. Unfortunately the section on his predecessors is lacunose because of damage to the stone, with the loss or partial loss of some of these Gurus' names. The inscription yields the following succession: …N > Vimalaśiva > Astraśiva—in ll. 5–6 I read …(l. 6) *vāstraśivābhidhānaḥ* where the editor, MIRASHI, reads …(l. 6) *vāstuśivābhidhānaḥ*: Astraśiva is a Saiddhāntika initiation name but *Vāstuśiva is not— > N? (if Astraśiva's successor was covered in the lost v. 11) > N-śiva (the first part of the name has been lost: …*śivaḥ śiṣyaḥ* in l. 6) …N > Puruṣaśiva, Guru of Yaśaḥkarṇa (r. 1073–1123) > Śaktiśiva, Guru of Yaśaḥkarṇa's successor Gayakarṇa (r. 1123–1153) Kīrtiśiva, Guru of Gayakarṇa's successor Narasiṃha (r. A.D. 1153–1163) > Vimalaśiva, Guru of Narasiṃha's successors Jayasiṃha (r. 1153–1188) and, on the evidence of *EI* 40:46, Vijayasiṃha (r. 1188–1210). Of N-śiva we are told (v. 11): + *śivaḥ śiṣyaḥ puruṣārthāya saṃpadam | guṇānāṃ ca dhanānāṃ ca paropakṛtaye param* '[His] disciple N-śiva [employed] his abundant virtues only for the accomplishment of the goal of human existence and his abundant wealth only for the welfare of others'; and of his now nameless successor we learn …(v. 15) *prītiḥ pātre ratis tīrthe sthitiḥ pathi mate satām | bhaktis bhave 'bhavat tasya samasya* 'That ascetic's only delight was in [giving to] worthy recipients, his only attachment was to holy sites, his only adherence was to the path approved by the good, and his only devotion was to Śiva'. Of Vimalaśiva we learn in v. 34cd: [*yacchā*]*yāṃ vibudhagaṇo 'dhigamya dhatte vaidhuryaṃ na khalu* [*mahotsa*]*vodayeṣu* 'Enter-

praised for building temples,[639] and the Rājaguru Mūrtiśiva for building many[640] and excavating numerous reservoirs.[641] In the Gurgi inscription Praśāntaśiva is said to have added a lofty temple of Śiva at Golagī to the north of one that had been established there by king Yuvarājadeva;[642] and in the Chandrehe inscription his successor Prabodhaśiva is said to have provided that place not only with a monastery but also with a water reservoir and a well.[643] The Gwalior Mu-

---

ing the shade [provided by the parasol] of this [patron] a multitude of brahmins was freed from the distress [of penury] on the splendid occasions of major festivals'; in v. 38: *yasyārthidvijarājadarśanavaśād dānāmbu[bhir vardhate] śraddhā [rātridivaṃ] vareṇa vidhinā dharmasya *tantrīr* (?) *iva | yo darśeṣv api sādaraṃ dvijapatīn akṣīṇaśobhābharān dakṣo yojayate suvarṇavikasatsadrohiṇīnāṃ śataiḥ* 'At the sight of great brahmin supplicants his faith grows day and night along with the [frequency with which he does] the pouring of the water of donation, in accordance with the best procedure, like a * ... (?) of religious duty. And on the days of the new moon [this] learned [Guru] bestows with devotion on the leading brahmins, their rich adornments never diminished, hundreds of fine ruddy cows shining with gold [adorning their horns]'; v. 41bc: *[dattaṃ] na yan nāsti tat | pātraṃ tan na yad arcitaṃ* 'there is no gift that he did not give, no worthy recipient whom he did not honour'; and v. 43: *udyānasarasī[sattra]prāsādadvijaveśmabhiḥ | bhūmiḥ paribhavaty asya na kair bhūṣābharair divam* 'With what rich adornments [created by him], with gardens, reservoirs, charitable feeding-houses, temples, and houses for brahmins, did [this] land not surpass heaven?'

[639] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 8ab: *śiṣyo dharmaśivas taponidhir abhūt tasya vyadhād yo 'dbhutaṃ prāsādam bhagavattrilocanaguror vārāṇasībhūṣaṇam* 'His disciple, the ascetic Dharmaśiva, built a marvellous temple of the blessed three-eyed teacher [of the world] that beautified Benares'; SIRCAR 1983b, v. 7cd: *śrīvidyāśiva ity asīmacaritas satkīrtiśākhāśataprāgbhārasthagitāmbaro munir abhūt tasmād yathārthānvayaḥ* 'After him came Vidyāśiva, an ascetic of boundless virtuous conduct, in whom the lineage fulfilled its purpose, who concealed the sky with the mass of the countless branches of his fine temples'; vv. 16–19.

[640] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 19: *mahīyasīyaṃ na tathā mahī yathā tapasvinas tasya mahān ihāśayaḥ | tathā hi bhūmiḥ kila kīrtibhir bhṛtā gato na tasyāśaya eṣa vismayaḥ* 'This land though vast was not large enough for the ambition of this ascetic. The wonder is that it did not cease even when the earth was filled to capacity by his temples'.

[641] SIRCAR 1983b, v. 17ab: *...nirmitāś citraṃ dikṣu vidikṣu yena pṛthivīhāra*śriyo* (conj. *śriyā* Ep.) *dīrghikāḥ* 'Wondrously he created reservoirs in all directions as a beautiful garland to adorn the land'.

[642] Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, v. 11: *yena śrīyuvarājakāritalasatkailāsaśṛṅgopamaprāsādottarataḥ sumeruśikharaspardhi prasiddha[m bhu]vi | sadma sthāpitam īśvarasya *sakalatrailokyavismāpakaṃ* (*trailokya* corr. MIRASHI : *trailākya* Ep.) *yat svargaṃ vrajatas tadīyayaśasaḥ sopānamārgāyate* 'To the north of the temple built by Yuvarāja that resembled the shining peak of Mt. Meru he built his famous temple of Śiva. That [too] rivals the peak of Meru, causing wonder throughout the three worlds, a flight of steps, as it were, for his fame as it ascends to heaven'. The repetition of the comparison with Mt. Kailāsa seems lame, but its probable point is that the Guru's temple was no less impressive than the king's.

[643] Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, v. 16cd: *anugiram atho sindhuprakhyaṃ taḍāgam acīkhanat pracurasalilaṃ kūpaṃ cātra prabodhaśivaḥ śamī* 'Then here [after building the monastery] the ascetic Prabodhaśiva excavated an ocean-like reservoir near the [Bhramara] hill and a well with abundant water'.

seum inscription records that Pataṅgaśiva built a great temple of Śiva[644] and excavated four huge reservoirs.[645] The Jubbulpore inscription records that the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva built a temple of Śiva Kīrtīśvara in honour of his preceptor and predecessor, the Rājaguru Kīrtiśiva.[646] A Kannaḍa inscription recording the death in 931 of the Śaiva Guru Tribhuvanakartaradeva *alias* Kaliyugarudra tells us that during the forty years of his rule as the pontiff of Āvani in Noḷambavāḍi he built fifty temples and two large water reservoirs;[647] and the Malkāpuram inscription records that the Rājaguru Viśveśvara founded temples to house Śivas bearing his own name in Viśveśvaragolakī, Mandrakūṭanagara, Candravallinagara, Viśveśvaranagara, Kommūrgrāma, and Uttarasomaśilā, and also that he founded a town with his own name (Viśveśvarapura) at Ānanda.[648]

The exalted status and king-like behaviour of these Gurus is reflected in the fact that we have inscriptions in which they have been given royal, even imperial titles. This is so with Vāmadeva, also called Vāmaśambhu, the Rājaguru of a Kalacuri of Tripurī who was probably Gāṅgeyadeva (r. c. 1015–1041), on whom that king is said to have transferred his status as the monarch (*nijarājalakṣmī*) as payment for his service as his Guru (*gurudakṣiṇā*) when he set out on a campaign of world conquest. Beginning with the inscriptions of his son and successor Karṇa (r.c. 1041–1071) the Kalacuri rulers of this kingdom are described as meditating on the feet of this Vāmadeva, to whose name are prefixed the imperial epithets *paramabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaparameśvaraparamamāheśvaraśrī-*. A variant of these titles, *samadhigatapañcamahāśabdaparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaparameśvara-*, is found in Noḷambavāḍi records attached to the names of two other Saiddhāntika Gurus, namely Brahmaśiva in an inscription of c. 870 and Varuṇaśiva in one of 936. Similarly, but more modestly, an inscription of 1331 on a step-well in the vicinity of the Acaleśvara temple on Mt. Abu tells us that it was constructed during the victorious reign of the great ascetic *rājaśrī*-Sarveśvara during the victorious reign of the ruler *rājaśrī*-Tejaḥsiṃha of Candrāvatī.[649]

---

[644] MIRASHI 1962, v. 29: *tenedaṃ haramandiraṃ suśikharaṃ yat sarvataḥ sundaraṃ bhaktyā kāritam indudhāmadhavalaṃ kailāsāśailopamam | ākalpaṃ sthiram astu tad bhuvi satām ānandadaṃ darśanād asyaivāmalam āgamat pariṇatiṃ prāsādamūrtyā yaśaḥ* 'Out of devotion he had this temple of Śiva built with its fine towers, altogether beautiful, white as the light of the moon, resembling Mt. Kailāsa. May it endure on earth to the end of the aeon, delighting the virtuous when they see it. His spotless fame has been transformed to take material form as [this] temple'.

[645] MIRASHI 1962, vv. (30–)38: *sutaṭaṃ catuṣṭayam idaṃ ruciraṃ cirabhūṣaṇaṃ mahīvadhvāḥ | vikaṭatarataḍāgānām acīkarac chrīpataṅgeśaḥ* 'Pataṅgaśiva made these four lovely and immense reservoirs with beautiful banks as an enduring ornament for the woman that is the earth'.

[646] *EI* 25:33, vv. 45–46: *[a]cīkarac candramauler mandiram ādarāt | guror kīrtiśivasyaitat kīrtaye sukṛtāya ca || devāya kīrtīśvarasaṃjñitāya prādād amuṣmai jayasiṃhadevaḥ | bibhrad bhave bhaktibharaṃ gurau ca grāmān raveḥ parvaṇi n + dāyān* 'He built out of reverence this temple of Śiva for the fame and religious merit of the Guru Kīrtiśiva. The god [installed in it] was named Kīrtiśvara; and King Jayasiṃha, having great devotion both to Śiva and [his] Guru, gave it [three] villages as * ... (?) gifts on the sacred day of the sun['s eclipse]'.

[647] *EC* 10, Mb:65: *svasti śrīmad-āvanyada sthānamaṃ nālvattu-varṣaman āḻd ayvattu-dēgulaṃ māḍi piriyav-eraḍu-ker̲eya kaṭṭi śaka-varṣam eṇṭu-nūr̲-embatta-mūr̲ ādand utkrānti geydu śrītribhuvanakarttara-devaṃ kali-yuga-rudrāṅka rudra-loka-prāptan ādaṃ* 'Hail! After governing the sacred domain of Āvani for forty years and building fifty temples and two large reservoirs, in the Śaka year 853 [the soul of] Tribhuvanakartaradeva *alias* Kaliyugarudra has ascended [from his body] and reached the world of Rudra'.

[648] PANTULU 1930, vv. 82–84, 88.

Clearly the Śaiva Rājaguru had become a far grander figure than the king's brahmanical chaplain, the Rājapurohita, who was tied to the service of a single king and was unambiguously his subordinate. Yet, it appears that the Śaivas did not rest with this but also sought to encroach on the territory of that lesser office. For the *Netratantra* shows the existence of a further class of Śaiva officiants who were to function in almost all the areas traditionally reserved for that officiant: the performance of the king's recurrent duties to worship the various deities on the days assigned to them, to celebrate the major annual royal festivals of the Indrotsava and Mahānavamī, to protect the royal family through rites to ward off ills, to restore them to health after illness, to ward off or counter the assaults of dangerous supernaturals, to empower through lustration (*nīrājanam*) the king's elephants, horses and weapons of war, and to protect the king with apotropaic rites before he eats, sleeps, and engages in his regular practice of martial skills.[650]

We see here one of several instances in which the Śaivas used their authority to colonize downwards, producing modifications of their ritual procedures for this purpose. These adapations inevitably entailed loss of status for those that implemented them, but we should understand that this did not affect those at the summit of the clerical hierarchy, the king-like Rājagurus, but only the humbler clones that extended their authority into domains that those Gurus would not deign to enter.

---

[649] For these imperial and royal titles attached to the names of Śaiva Gurus see D.C. SIRCAR in *EI* 30:10, pp. 46–51. There he refutes the claims expressed by V.V. MIRASHI in *EI* 27:29. These are (1) that Vāmadeva is a king Vāmarājadeva [seen by him alone] in the Saugor inscription of Śaṅkaragaṇa, which has been assigned on palaeographic grounds to the eight century, (2) that this king should be assigned to the second half of the seventh century, and (3) that the references in inscriptions of the later Kalacuris to these king's devotion to [the memory] of Vāmadeva, should be referred to this much earlier monarch as the founder of their dynasty. SIRCAR removes Vāmadeva from the Saugor inscription, reading *-vāvarāja-* rather than *-vāmarāja-* and citing other examples of *vāva-* or *bāva-* in inscriptions, and then cites these examples of imperial or royal epithets bestowed on Śaiva Gurus to counter MIRASHI's argument that their being prefixed to the name of Vāmadeva proves that he was a king not a Guru. I side with SIRCAR. His view has the great strength that it accords (1) with the testimony of the Malkāpuram inscription of 1261/2, which, referring to Vāmaśambhu as the third Guru in succession after Sadbhāvaśambhu, the first pontiff of the Maṭha at Golagī, reports that the Kalacuri kings were being praised (*praśaṃsyanie*) [in their Praśastis] up to the present as worshippers of his feet (PANTULU 1930, v. 28: *atha nṛpaśekharamālālālitapādo 'tra vāmaśambhur abhūt | adyāpi kalacurīśā yaccaraṇārādhakāḥ praśaṃsyante*)—in the inscriptions of the Kalacuris of Tripurī from Karṇa onwards they are said to be *-vāmadevapādānudhyāta*—, (2) with the fact that there is no reference to a king Vāmadeva in any of the inscriptions of those kings, and (3) with the fact that the source which reports the Kalacuri king's bestowing his *rājalakṣmī* on Vāmadeva refers to the latter as an ascetic (*sāhasikas tapasvine vāmadevanāmne nijarājalakṣmīṃ gurudakṣiṇāyai dattvā sarvāṃ bhūmiṃ jetuṃ prasthitavān*). SIRCAR convincingly identifies the Kalacuri king here called Sāhasika as Gāṅgeyadeva on the grounds that the latter was both an illustrious conqueror and known as Sāhasāṅka 'he who has the cognomen Sāhasa'. This source, cited by SIRCAR (*EI* 30:10, p. 50), is a paraphrase in Jonarāja's commentary on the *Pṛthivīrājavijaya* of Jayānaka of a verse of that work now lost in a lacuna.

The inscription referring to Brahmaśiva is *EC* 10, Śrīnivāsapura taluk, no. 27 (p. 346). SIRCAR (*EI* 30:10, p. 49) wrongly gives the name as Bhramaraśiva and the page reference as 376. The relevant part of the inscription is: *svasti samadhigatapañcamahāśabda pallavānvaya śrīpṛthivīvallava pallavānvayakulatilakam śrīmat-noḷambādhirājar pṛthivīrājya geye svasti samadhigatapañcamahāśabda paramabhaṭṭā[ra]ka mahārājādhirāja parameśvara ātaniya mata . . pana . . . . nvita śivaśāstratapovanānurāga śrīpādhivāḷagrāmavirnirggata bhagavatpādaikaśaraṇa śrīmat-brahmaśivācāryyan*. The inscription referring to Varuṇaśiva (Varuṇaśivabhaṭāra) is *SII* 9, 1:24 (*ARE* 759 of 1916) from Gunimorabagalu in the Anantapur District. It speaks of him as the pontiff of the Noṇambeśvarara temple, as the ruler of Paḷivālubāḷu, and as the Mahāsāmantādhipati, that is to say, as a feudatory of the highest rank, of king Bīraṇolamba Aṇṇayyadeva of the Noḷamba-Pallava dynasty (= Aṇṇiga, r.c. 932–940). The Noṇambeśvarara is probably the imposing temple at Hemāvatī now known as Doḍḍeśvara (COHEN 1989, p. 50, and p. 63, note 36). He is also mentioned in an inscription on the Maṇḍapa of the Doḍḍeśvara temple, which gives the information that he was the disciple of Rudraśivācārya. On Varuṇaśiva see COHEN 1998, pp. 24, 35, and 41–42, who plausibly concludes that he was Aṇṇiga's Rājaguru. The initiation-names Brahmaśiva, Varuṇaśiva, and Rudraśiva reveal that these Gurus were Saiddhāntikas. The relevant portion of the inscription from Mt. Abu has been published by SIRCAR within this discussion (*EI* 30:10, p. 48).

[650] The purpose, date, and provenance of the *Netratantra* are the subject of SANDERSON 2005b.

Śaivism and the Royal Temple

The second element of the early medieval process to which I have drawn attention is the proliferation of land-owning temples. All but the most ephemeral sovereigns during this period, both in the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, gave material form to the legitimacy and solidity of their power by building grand temples in which images of their chosen God were installed, animated, named after themselves (*svanāmnā*), and endowed with land and officiants to support their cult. As we have seen, the great majority of these temples enshrined Śiva [in the form of a Liṅga].

The Śaivas of the Mantramārga provided specialized officiants and rituals to establish these Śivas, developing in course of time a secondary body of scriptural authorities, the Pratiṣṭhātantras, devoted exclusively to this domain, setting out the rituals of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) and defining the norms for the form of the Liṅga, the iconography of ancillary images, and the architectural design of the various temple types.[651] Moreover, they asserted the principle that the Śaiva Sthāpaka, the specialist who performs these rituals, is competent not only in the Śaiva domain but also on all the levels that the Śaivas ranked below it. Thus they claimed that he is empowered to officiate in the construction and consecration of non-Śaiva deities such as Viṣṇu following the Pañcarātra.[652] This

universalization of their authority, which is backed by learned theory of the relation of the Śaiva with the other bodies of scriptural injunction, seems not have been merely theoretical. For the Śaiva Paddhati literature contains instructions for the consecration of Viṣṇus, as we have seen in the case of the Paddhati of Somaśambhu,[653] and Vaiṣṇava sources protest at this encroachment, insisting that images of Viṣṇu installed by Śaivas should be reconsecrated.[654]

---

[651] None of the early works of this class have been published. Those known to learned authors before the end of the eleventh century and surviving in manuscripts are the *Mayasaṃgraha*, not to be confused with the published *Mayamata*, a later south-Indian work, the *Piṅgalāmata*, the *Mohacūḍottara*, and the *Devyāmata*, which declares itself the *pratiṣṭhātantram* of the *Niśvāsa*. Four other works of this type, not known to have survived, are cited by the Kashmirian Vidyākaṇṭha around the beginning of the eleventh century in his commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha*: the *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara*, the *Nandikeśvaramata*, the *Paitāmaha*, and the *Pratiṣṭhāsamuccaya*, the last of which was probably a Paddhati rather than a scripture. On all these texts see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 440–442.

[652] See, e.g., *Bṛhatkālottara*, B f. 108v4: *bauddhavaiṣṇavapañcārthe saurakālamukhādiṣu | śaivaḥ sarvādhikārī syān na śaive 'mī kathaṃcana* 'The Śaiva [Guru] has competence that extends into all [religious systems], the Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava, Pañcārtha[-Pāśupata], Saura, Kālamukha, and others; but [Gurus of] those have absolutely no competence to act in the Śaiva [system]'; *Kāmika*, *Pūrvabhāga* 1.121c–126, on the authority of the Śivabrāhmaṇas, the married Śaiva brahmins who alone were competent to officiate for others: *śaivaḥ sarvādhikārī syāt svakīye ca paratra ca || 122 śaivāḥ sarveṣu kurvanti ye gṛhasthā dvijottamāḥ | yāmale mātṛtantre ca kāpāle pāñcarātrake || 123 bauddhe cārhamate caiva lākule vaidike 'pi ca | anyeṣv api ca mārgeṣu tattacchāstraiḥ svaśāstrataḥ || 124 śaivāḥ kurvanti dīkṣādyaṃ talliṅgasthāpanādikam | mukhyatvād iha śaivasya mukhamāhātmyato 'pi ca || 125 adhikāro 'sty sarvatra nānyeṣāṃ śivadarśane | tasmāt parārtham ātmārthaṃ sthāpanaṃ yajanaṃ tathā || 126 śivavipreṇa kartavyam anyeṣāṃ svārtham eva hi | parārtham api kuryāc cet *lobhena* (em. : *lopena* Ed.) *nṛpates tathā | tadrāṣṭrasya ca nāśaḥ syād acireṇa na saṃśayaḥ* 'The Śaiva is competent in all [systems], both his own and others. Married Śaivas, the foremost of brahmins, can officiate in all [the systems, namely] the Yāmala and Mātṛtantra, the Kāpālika, the Pāñcarātra, the Buddhist, the Jaina, the Lākula, the Vaidika, and yet others, using the scriptures of these systems in accordance with their own. [Such] Śaiva[brahmin]s perform initiations and the like, the installation of images, and so forth [in these other systems], because the teaching of Śiva is superior [to all others] and because the mouth [of Puruṣa] has been glorified [in the *Puruṣasūkta* as the part of his body from which the brahmins, as the highest caste-class, were created]. [The Śivabrāhmaṇa] is competent to act in all [systems], but not others in the teaching of Śiva. Therefore the Śivabrāhmaṇa [alone] may worship and install [images] both for others and himself. Others may act only for themselves. If out of greed [anyone other than a Śivabrāhmaṇa] performs rituals for the benefit of others[, thus usurping the exclusive right of the Śivabrāhmaṇas], then without doubt both the king and his kingdom will swiftly be destroyed'.

[653] See *Somaśambhupaddhati* vol. 4, pp. 294–311 (*viṣṇusthāpanavidhiḥ*).

[654] In his *Pañcarātrarakṣā* (pp. 26–27) Vedāntadeśika, the influential Śrīvaiṣṇava of the fourteenth century (*EI* 13, p. 222), quotes a passage from the Śaiva *Kāraṇatantra* that is more or less identical with 1.121c–124 of the passage of the *Kāmika*, *Pūrvabhāga* cited above, and after asserting that it is inadmissible as evidence because all Śaiva Tantras are condemned by Vedic authorities quotes a passage from the south-Indian Pāñcarātrika *Pādmasaṃhitā* (*Caryāpāda* 19.128b–130) to the effect that if a Viṣṇu has been installed with the system of the Śaivas it must be re-installed following the system of the Pañcarātra and purified by bathing with a thousand vases. See also *Viṣvaksenasaṃhitā* 39.283–285: *sthāpite raudramārgeṇa pūjyamāne dine dine | hitvā raudravidhānaṃ tu sarveṣāṃ hitakāmyayā || grāmavṛddhikaraṃ puṇyaṃ rājabhūsuravardhanam | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena hitvā raudraṃ tu tatkṣaṇāt || sthāpayet sāttvatenātha vidhinā pūjayed dharim | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena na kuryāt tantrasaṃkaram* 'If [a Viṣṇu] has been installed following the Śaiva procedure and is in daily worship [following the same] then, desiring the welfare of all, one should abandon the Śaiva procedure and [adopt] the holy [Vaiṣṇava procedure] that will cause the village, the king, and the brahmins to prosper. Therefore one should abandon the Śaiva rites immediately and scrupulously re-install the Viṣṇu with the Pāñcarātrika ritual and and worship it [with the same thereafter]. So one must take great care to avoid [this] contamination of the [Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava] systems of worship'; 39.305–306: *jātisaṃkaraṇenaiva jagac caṇḍālatāṃ vrajet | tantrasaṃkaraṇenaiva rājarāṣṭraṃ vinaśyati || rāṣṭraṃ śarīraṃ rājñas tu rājā jīvaḥ sa ucyate | rāṣṭrakṣaye kṣayo rājñaḥ tasmād rakṣyaṃ dvayaṃ budhaiḥ* 'People become untouchables through the contamination of castes. Through the contamination of the systems of worship the king and kingdom are destroyed. [The scriptures] teach that the kingdom is the body and the king its soul. [So] when the kingdom is destroyed, so is the king. The wise, therefore, should guard both [by preventing the encroachment of the Śaivas into the Pāñcarātrika domain]'. Śaiva ritual is called *raudra-* in the first of these passages

The involvement of the Śaivas of the Mantramārga in the temple cult covered in early Śaiva scriptural sources and all the early Paddhatis up to at least the twelfth century does not extend beyond the performing of the rituals necessary to initiate the cult by consecrating the images and the temples that house them. The texts are silent on the nature of the worship that would be performed before those images once the Śaiva Guru had completed his task. It would appear, therefore, that the temple worship was in the hands of officiants of a different kind. However, the texts lagged behind reality in this regard. For at some point, well before the Śaiva literature was prepared to register this fact, there were Śaivas of the Mantramārga working as the priests that performed the regular rituals in the Śaiva temples. The new practice is first attested in the Far South in the late seventh century. We learn from a grant of the Pallava Parameśvaravarman I (r.c. 655–960) that a certain Anantaśivācārya, whose name makes it very probable that he was an initiated Saiddhāntika officiant,[655] was appointed as the priest with hereditary rights to perform the ritual of worship (*devakarma*) in the temple of Śiva Vidyāvinītapallavaparameśvara established with his name by the Pallava king Parameśvaravarman I *alias* Vidyāvinīta.[656]

The persistent disjunction during this period between what was prescribed for Śaivas and what was being done by some of them is due, I propose, to the fact that functioning as a priest in a temple, and therefore living off the endowment of the deity in return for one's work, carried a loss of status with which the older tradition was unwilling to be associated. According to brahmanical sources any brahmin who persists in such work for three years is considered to

---

in keeping with the mildly disparaging south-Indian Vaiṣṇava practice of referring to Śiva as Rudra. Cf. the expression *rudrakālyupajīvakaḥ* cited here, p. 278 and the rule of the *Śāṇḍilyasmṛti* quoted by Vedāntadeśika in his *Pañcarātrarakṣā* (p. 62) that Vaiṣṇavas should keep far away from temples of Buddha, Rudra, and the like (*buddharudrādivasatiṃ śmaśānaṃ śavam eva ca | aṭaviṃ rājadhānīṃ ca dūrataḥ parivarjayet*).

[655] Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiated brahmins have initiation-names (*dīkṣānāma*) that end in -śiva (with -śambhu or, less commonly, -īśvara/-īśa or -śaṅkara as synonyms) as the second of their two components, and those of these who have been consecrated to officiate by receiving the *ācāryābhiṣekaḥ* are referred to as N-śivācārya, a practice that has continued into modern times. Other Anantaśivācāryas are the author of the *Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhyā*, one of the Śivācāryas, probably 95 in all, among 108 12th-century labelled images at Dārāśuram in Tamilnāḍu (SRINIVASAN 1987, vol. 1:17, no. 60), and one mentioned in an inscription of 1571 at the Vaṭāraṇyeśvara temple at Tiruvālaṅgāḍu (*ARE* 497 of 1906 [Appendix B: stone inscriptions copied in 1905]) as a disciple of Ponnambala Dharmaśivācārya and Guru of Immaḍi Dharmaśivācārya.

[656] The Kūram plates of Parameśvaravarman I (r.c. 655–90): MAHALINGAM 1998:46, ll. 55–57 (Sanskrit) and ll. 84–88 (Tamil).

have lost his brahmin status and is then known as a Devalaka.[657] He is described as an *upabrāhmaṇaḥ* 'a sub-brahmin' or, even more disparagingly, as a *brāhmaṇacaṇḍālaḥ* 'a brahmin untouchable';[658] and this loss of status is confirmed in modern times in the way that the Smārtha brahmins, the dominant community in Tamilāḍu have viewed the Ādiśaiva community that provides the priests who after undergoing Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiation (*dīkṣā*) and consecration as Ācāryas (*ācāryābhiṣekaḥ*) perform the worship in the Śiva temples of the region. They were forbidden to live in brahmin streets and the Smārthas would not intermarry or interdine with them.[659] The Ādiśaivas, as one might expect, resisted this condemnation, arguing in their scriptural productions and in learned exegesis that it applies only to brahmins other than members of their endogamous community, more precisely that the three-year rule applies to Śaiva initiates other than themselves. Strengthening the brahmanical position they held that Śiva has ruled that ordinary, uninitiated brahmins who work as temple-priests will forfeit their status after only six months.[660] As modern practice reveals, this counterargument had no effect on the Smārtha majority; and, indeed, it is obvious that its real purpose was rather to defend their professional rights against encroachment by others, rights that they took care to write into their scriptures.[661] For, no doubt in consequence of the efflorescence of the Śaiva temple cult under the Coḷa emperors, we find a new wave of Śaiva scriptures appearing in the South, in which the ceremonial life of the temple and the duties and rights of its priests are regulated, and, indeed, form their principal subject matter. Citations from the majority of the scriptural texts of this kind do not appear before the works of Vedajñānaguru II, composed during the second half

---

[657] Yāmuna, *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, pp. 15–16: *tathā ca devalaḥ "devakośopajīvī yaḥ sa devalaka ucyate" iti | tathā "vṛttyarthaṃ pūjayed devaṃ trīṇi varṣāṇi yo dvijaḥ | sa vai devalako nāma sarvakarmasu garhitaḥ" iti* 'And Devala [teaches]: "One who lives off the wealth of a god is called a Devalaka", and: "Any brahmin who does the worship of a god for his living for three years is called a Devalaka, and is condemned in all rites"'. By 'condemned in all rites' the text means that such a brahmin must not be chosen as an officiant in any brahmanical ritual or invited as a participant in a Śrāddha.

[658] Atri cited in *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p. 16: *tathā ca viśadataram amīṣām evopabrāhmaṇyaṃ varṇayaty atriḥ: "āhvāyakā devalakāḥ kalpadevalakā gaṇabhogadevalakā bhāgavatavṛttir iti caturthaḥ. eta upabrāhmaṇāḥ" iti* 'And Atri makes it absolutely clear that it is those that are sub-brahmins, when he says: "Couriers, Devalakas, Kalpadevalakas, Gaṇabhogadevalakas, and fourth, he who lives by being a Bhāgavata: these are sub-brahmins"'; and *Mahābhārata* 12.77.8: *āhvāyakā devalakā nakṣatragrāmayājakāḥ ete brāhmaṇacaṇḍālā mahāpathikapañcamāḥ* 'All the following are brahmin untouchables: couriers, temple-priests, those who perform worship to the asterisms, those who perform worship on behalf of a whole village, and, fifth, those who undertake long journeys'.

[659] See THURSTON 1909, p. 51, and FULLER 1984, pp. 49–71. The Dikshitars, the priests of Śiva at Cidambaram, rank above the Ādiśaivas, probably because they are the trustees of their temple; but they are still considered inferior to non-priestly brahmins; see FULLER 1984, p. 192, n. 3.

[660] Vedajñāna II, *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* A, p. 123 and B, p. 99, quoting the *Vīratantra* and the *Saṃtānatantra*: *vīratantre "bhṛtyarthaṃ sarvadākālam ādiśaivaḥ śivaṃ yajet | tac ca svadharmānuṣṭhānaṃ na doṣāya prakalpate || adīkṣitaś caturvedī śivaliṅgaṃ na saṃspṛśet | dīkṣitaś cāpi yo vipro bhṛtyarthaṃ tu na pūjayet || ātmārthapūjāṃ kuryāt *parārthaṃ naiva* (A: *parārthañ caiva* B) *pūjayet" | saṃtāne "adīkṣito 'pi yo vipraḥ ṣaṇmāsaṃ tu śivaṃ spṛśet | so 'pi devalakaḥ proktaḥ sa nārho devapūjane | dīkṣitaś cāpi yo vipro *bhṛtyarthaṃ* (em.: *pratyarthaṃ* A: *bhṛtyāñced* B) *vatsaratrayāt | pūjayed yadi deveśaṃ so 'pi devalako bhaved" iti* '*Vīratantra*: An Ādiśaiva may worship Śiva for a living permanently; and that, since it is his reli-

---

gious duty, cannot be sinful [for him]. An uninitiated [brahmin], [even if he is one] who knows [all] four Vedas, may not [even] touch the Liṅga of Śiva; and even a brahmin who has been initiated may not worship [it] for a living [unless he is an Ādiśaiva]. He should worship [Śiva] for his own benefit [as a private individual]. He may not also worship him for the benefit of others [as a priest in the temple]. *Saṃtāna*: If an uninitiated brahmin has physical contact with a Śiva [installed in a fixed Liṅga in a temple] for six months he is called a Devalaka and is disqualified from offering worship to [any] deity [thereafter]. Even an initiated brahmin becomes a Devalaka if he [is not an Ādiśaiva but] worships Śiva for a living, once three years [of his doing so] have passed'; and Kacchapeśvaraśivācārya, *Kriyākramadyotikāvyākhyā*, p. 80, ll. 4–7, quoting the *Vīratantra*: *adīkṣitaś caturvedī na spṛśen nāpi cārcayet | bhṛtyarthaṃ parameśānaṃ dīkṣāvirahitā janāḥ | *ṣaṇmāsād yānti* (em.: *ṣaṇmāsāvyānti* Cod.) *pātityaṃ te ca devalakāḥ smṛtāḥ || trīṇi varṣāṇi bhṛtyarthaṃ sthiraliṅge *hi dīkṣitaḥ* (em.: *hy adīkṣitaḥ* Cod.) | *pūjayed yadi *vipras* (corr.: *viprās* Cod.) *tu sa vai devalako bhaved iti* 'An uninitiated [brahmin], [even if he is one] who knows [all] four Vedas, may not touch and worship Śiva for a living. The uninitiated fall from their caste after six months [if they do so]. It is they that are known as Devalakas. If an initiated brahmin [who is not an Ādiśaiva] performs the worship [of Śiva] in a fixed Liṅga for a living for three years[, that is to say, as a priest serving in a temple,] then he [too] will become a Devalaka'. In the older, north-Indian literature the *Prāyaścittapaṭala* of the *Dvādaśasāhasra Svacchanda*, quoted by Hṛdayaśiva in his *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, f. 92v3–4, defines Devalakas when considering the matter of contamination by them, as those who as priests (*bhojakāḥ*) live off the Moon-god, Brahmā, the Sun-god, Skanda, Viṣṇu, the Goddess, or the Mothers: *somabrahmaraviskandaviṣṇudevyaś ca mātaraḥ | upajīvanti ye devi pūjayitvā tu bhojakāḥ | te vai devalakās teṣām prāyaścittaṃ vadāmy aham.* The omission of Śiva from this list implies that it is only the priests of other gods that fall from caste. Likewise, defending the Pāñcarātrika priests of Viṣṇu's temples against the same consequence, Yāmuna argued, citing Vyāsa, that it is only those who earn their live off Rudra (i.e. Śiva) and Kālī by serving as their priests that become Devalakas (*bhaved devalako yo vai rudrakālyupajīvakaḥ*): Vaiṣṇava temple-priests do not become Devalakas, because they have been consecrated for their work by initiation. See Yāmuna, *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, pp. 15–17 (the accusation), and pp. 156–157 (the rebuttal).

[661] See, for example, the *Kāmika* cited here p. 274, the *Vīra* and *Raurava* cited in BRUNNER 1964, p. 468, n. 11, and the *Yogaja*, *Cintya*, *Vīra*, *Saṃtāna*, and other Āgamas cited by Vedajñānaguru II in his *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* A, pp. 121–123 and B, pp. 97–99.

of the sixteenth century.[662] But some others are already being cited in the thirteenth, and one in the twelfth.[663]

Here too, of course, the royal connection is maintained and carefully nurtured. Thus the ceremonial repertoire of these temples included special rituals for the king's protection (*rājarakṣā*);[664] and temple festivals (*utsavaḥ*) were often timed to coincide with the day of his natal asterism or of that of a member of his family.[665] Indeed the texts place a great emphasis on the connection between the temple and the welfare of the ruler and his kingdom, warning repeatedly that while the proper maintenance of the temple and its ceremonies will benefit both, deviations or neglect will have dire consequences for them. This duty to maintain the *status quo* naturally included that of recognizing the exclusive hereditary rights of the members of this priestly community.[666]

The Ādiśaivas are the only endogamous community of Saiddhāntika Śaiva temple-priests for which we have evidence and they seem not to have operated beyond south India. But it seems likely that there were parallel developments in other parts of the subcontinent, evidence of which has been lost or not yet come to light.[667]

---

[662] These scriptures that first appear in the works of Vedajñānaguru are the *Aṃśumat*, the *Ajita*, the *Kāśmīratantra*, the *Cintyaviśva* / *Cintyaviśvasādākhya*, the *Dīpta*, the *Devīkālottara*, the *Bhīma*, the *Makuṭa*, the *Mukhabimba*, the *Yogaja*, the *Raurava*, the *Vijaya* (/*Vijayottara*), the *Vidveṣaṇa*, the *Vīra*, the *Saṃtāna*, the *Sahasra*, the *Siddha*, the *Sūkṣma*, and the *Skandakālottara*. The works of Vedajñānaguru in which they are cited are the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati*, *Dīkṣādarśa*, and *Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī*. For his date see DAGENS 1979, pp. 6–7.

[663] The extant *Kāmika* is perhaps the first work of this kind to be cited in a dateable work. Substantial passages found in it are quoted without attribution in the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva, a teacher of Trilocanaśiva and therefore a near contemporary of Aghoraśiva, who completed his *Kriyākramadyotikā* in 1157. The next earliest known work in which there are citations from such scriptures is the *Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā* composed by a nameless author in the thirteenth century, probably in its second half. This date follows from the fact that he identifies himself as the great-great-grandson of the same Trilocanaśiva. He cites the *Kāraṇa*, the *Acintya*, the *Suprabheda*, the south-Indian *Pauṣkara*, and the *Vātulaśuddhākhya*. I derive this information concerning the citations in the *Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā* and Jñānaśiva's unattributed citations of the *Kāmika* from a lecture given by Dr. Dominic Goodall in the Early Tantra Workshop held in Kathmandu in September 2008. For the relationships between Aghoraśiva, Jñānaśiva, and Trilocanaśiva see GOODALL 2000 and for confirmation of the date of Aghoraśiva's *Kriyākramadyotikā* see GOODALL 1998, pp. xiii–xvii, fn. 24. No Sanskrit Saiddhāntika works have yet been identified which can be dated within the period of three centuries between the author of the *Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā* and Vedajñānaguru II.

[664] Chapters devoted to this protective temple ritual for the king are found in such south-Indian Śaiva texts as the *Sūkṣmāgama* (pp. 290–297: *rājarakṣāvidhiḥ*), and the *Dīptāgama* (pp. 211–215: *rājarakṣāvidhipaṭalaḥ*).

[665] See DAVIS and ORR 2007, p. 91, for epigraphical evidence of such arrangements.

[666] See, for example, the passage of the *Kāmika* cited above, p. 274.

Śaivism and New Settlements

The early Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantras show that the authority of the Śaiva Sthāpaka was to extend to the creation of the palaces of their kings. Among the early Pratiṣṭhātantras the *Mayasaṃgraha*, *Mohacūḍottara*, and *Piṅgalāmata*,

---

[667] Against the view that the Ādiśaiva caste is peculiar to Tamil Nadu one might cite the fact that the Ādiśaivas are mentioned the *Somaśambhupaddhati*, a work composed in the eleventh century far to the north (at the end of the *Pavitrārohaṇavidhi*): *pañcayojanasaṃsthe 'pi pavitraṃ gurusaṃnidhau | kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāñchitaṃ phalam | sarvaṃ vai tv ādiśaivānāṃ dīkṣitānāṃ śivoditam | paropakāraśīlena śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*. However, the line is not in the edition based on Kashmirian manuscripts (see *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* vv. 494c–496b: *pañcayojanasaṃsthe 'pi pavitraṃ gurusaṃnidhau || kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāñchitaṃ phalam | adhītaśivaśāstreṇa kṛto 'yaṃ somaśambhunā || karmakāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ sphuṭaḥ*) nor in the Nepalese transmission (see *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* f. 22v4–5: *pañcayojanasaṃstho 'pi pavitraṃ gurusaṃnidhau | kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāñchitaṃ phalam | paropakāraśīlena śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*). It is found only in BRUNNER's edition and the Devakoṭṭai edition, which her edition reproduces here. It rests, therefore, exclusively on the evidence of Grantha manuscripts from the south. Evidently, then, one must suspect that the line has been interpolated in Tamil Nadu by a redactor in the Ādiśaiva community. Its lack of intelligible connection with what precedes and follows strengthens this suspicion.

I have not seen the term Ādiśaiva in any inscription. There the officiants of the Śiva temples are always termed *śivabrāhmaṇaḥ* or *śivadvijaḥ*. That term first occurs to my knowledge c. A.D. 863 in an inscription of Pallava Nandivarman III, from Tiruvallam in North Arcot (MAHALINGAM 1988:132). Concerning a grant to the temple of Parameśvara at Tīkkālivallam it specifies that 500 kāḍi of paddy are for the Śivabrāhmaṇas who offer worship and services in the sanctum (*ār[ā]di[t]t-upāśarikkum [śiva]brāhmaṇarkku*) (ll. 25–26). Thereafter the term is commonplace. But it is clear that it is the group known as the Ādiśaivas that is intended, because in these inscriptions when Śivabrāhmaṇas are named their Gotras are sometimes given and these are those of the Ādiśaivas as attested both by their prescriptive texts and among their modern descendants, namely Kauśika, Kāśyapa, Bhāradvāja, Gautama, Ātreya, Āgastya, and Pārāśara. See, e.g., *SII* 3:41 (Kāśyapa), 55 (Kauśika), 58 (Kauśika), 209 (Kauśika, Kāśyapa, Kauśika); *SII* 12:197 (Āgastya); *SII* 17:152 (Bhāradvāja), 157 (Bhāradvāja), 160 and 161 (Gautama), 162 and 163 (Bhāradvāja), 165 (Gautama, Parāśara), 203 (Ātreya, Bhāradvāja), and 730 (Kāśyapa); *EC* 3, Sr:44 (Gautama); *EC* 10, Kl:106a (Kauśika), 106d (Gautama), 107 (Kauśika), 187 (Kauśika, Kāśyapa); *EC* 10, Bp:29, 32, 35a, and 37a (all Gautama, Bhāradvāja). Six of the seven, minus Āgastya, are listed in the *Saṃtāna* as cited in the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* A, p. 125. Five of them, lacking Ātreya and Parāśara, are listed in *Svāyambhuva*, p. 14 (*Ācāryalakṣaṇapaṭala* 94c–95b). This evidence accords with contemporary testimony. According to the data collected by FULLER (1984, p. 28) the Ādiśaiva priests of the Mīnākṣīsundareśvara temple in Madurai belong to the Kāśyapa, Kauśika, Bhāradvāja, Gautama, and Ātreya Gotras.

all prescribe the layout of the royal palace in detail, the latter two distinguishing between different classes, the highest being that of a paramount sovereign or Mahārājādhirāja;[668] and in the first two works the design prescribed includes a section of the palace reserved for teachers of the Śaiva Mantramārga (*mantriṇaḥ*, *mantramārgopadeśinaḥ*).[669] But the layout of the palace taught in these Pratiṣṭhātantras is only part of the layout for an urban settlement to be established by the king around the palace, complete with markets and segregated areas for the dwellings of the various castes and artisans, with instructions for the size and plan of these dwellings determined by caste status.[670] The founding of such royal towns is not explicitly enjoined in the Śaivas' ritual manuals. That is to say that no ritual of *nagarapratiṣṭhā* was envisaged. The Sthāpaka was engaged, it seems, only for the choice and consecration of the site (*vāstupūjā*) and his instructions followed for the layout of the buildings to be constructed upon it. Nonetheless, we see the Śaivas involving themselves in one aspect of the third of the elements of medieval process that I have listed, namely the creation of new urban settlements from above. The epigraphical record and Kalhaṇa's history of Kashmir demonstrate that any king of substance felt it encumbent on him to demonstrate his sovereignty not only by the building of temples but also by the creation of new urban settlements (*puram*), which, like the deities he established, were generally named after him.[671]

One of the early Pratiṣṭhātantras, the *Devyāmata*, devotes its 66th chapter to the layout to be followed not only in new towns but also in new villages, with an emphasis on the positioning of the various deities within the plan and the directions in which they should face. The regulations imposed show us Śaiva officiants on a purely civic level. There is nothing specifically Śaiva in the layout. The *Devyāmata*'s chapter on iconography shows further evidence of the involvement of the Śaivas in both urban and rural planning. Differentiating various forms of Śiva in accordance with mood and number of arms it tells the Sthāpaka which are appropriate where.[672] The same concern can be seen in the Pratiṣṭhā sections of the South-Indian Yāmalatantra texts with regard to the positioning and iconography of the images of Bhadrakālī whose installation and cult are their concern.[673]

---

[668] The layout of the royal palace is prescribed in *Mayasaṃgraha* ff. 33v–34r (5.188–199), *Mohacūḍottara* ff. 20v–22r (4.245c–281), and *Piṅgalāmata* ff. 74r–75v (10.126–180).

[669] *Mayasaṃgraha* ff. 33v–34r (5.191–193b): *vitathe mantriṇāṃ dhāma sarvāstrāṇi gṛhakṣate | antaḥpuraṃ yamapade gandharve gātṛsaṃśrayam || bhṛṅge senāpatisthānaṃ mṛganābhyādikaṃ mṛge | paitre śaucagṛhaṃ cātra tāmbūlādivyapāśrayam || avarodhavadhūsthānaṃ sugrīve tu tato nyaset*; *Mohacūḍottara* 4.257c–258b: *vitathe mantriṇāṃ sthānaṃ mantramārgopadeśinām || śastram antaḥpuraṃ gātṛ kastūrī śaucaveśma ca | tāmbūlasaṃgrahaḥ strīṇāṃ *pālakān* (em. : *pācakān* Cod.) *strīniyāmakān*.

[670] *Mayasaṃgraha* ff. 34v–35r (5.209–216); *Mohacūḍottara* f. 21v1–6 (4.270–275b); *Piṅgalāmata* ff. 75v–76r (10.181–194).

[671] This practice was followed both throughout the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, as the following examples demonstrate: in Kashmir Pravarasena II's Pravarapura (Śrīnagar), Durlabhaka-Pratāpāditya II's Pratāpapura, Jayāpīḍa's Jayapura, Lalitāditya's Lalitapura, Avantivarman's Avantipura, Śaṅkaravarman's Śaṅkarapura, and Diddā's Diddāpura, in eastern India Rāmāvatī (Rāmauti) (of Rāmapāla), Vijayapura of Vijayasena, and Lakṣmaṇāvatī (Lakhnauti) (of Lakṣmaṇasena), in the south Gaṅgaikoṇḍacolapura, Parakesaripura, Parāntakapura, Rājakesaripura, Rājarājapura, Rājādityapura, Rājāśrayapura, Rājendracolapura, Vikramacolapura, Vikramapāṇḍyapura, Vikramasiṃhapura, Vīrarājendracolapura, Vīrarājendrapura, and, among the Khmers Īśānapura, Bhavapura, Yaśodharapura, Rājendrapura, and Jayendranagarī.

ŚAIVISM AND IRRIGATION

The creation of new settlements and the concomitant extension of agriculture required the provision of the means of irrigation. Rituals for the consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*) of wells (*kūpaḥ*), step-wells (*vāpī*), and reservoirs (*puṣkariṇī*, *taḍāgaḥ*) were already provided by the brahmanical tradition. A Vaidika procedure of the Gṛhya type is outlined or touched upon in a number of sources;[674] a more elaborate, Paurāṇika form of the ritual, taking five days and requiring twenty-four priests in addition to the Sthāpaka, is set out at length in the *Matsyapurāṇa* (58.4–56);[675] and the currency of this form is evident from the fact that it became the basis of further elaboration.[676] There is no trace of irrigation rituals in the early Śaiva scriptures, including the Pratiṣṭhātantras. But in due course Śaiva officiants, seeking to add this important domain to their ritual repertoire, produced their own version. It first surfaces in our surviving evidence towards the end of the eleventh century, in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu,[677] and from that source entered both later Paddhatis such as the *Siddhāntaśekhara* and the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* and the second wave of Śaiva scriptural literature produced in southern India.[678] In spite of the Śaivized character of these new rituals the underlying model is still recognizably that of the brahmanical tradition. The Śaiva elements are little more than a veneer on what it essentially a brahmanical procedure, marked by such distinctive features as the erecting of a Nāga pole (*nāgayaṣṭiḥ*) at the centre of the excavation, the casting of metal images of aquatic creatures into the water, the crossing of the excavation by a cow followed by the patron of the rite, the making of offerings to Varuṇa, and the giving of the cow to the officiant.[679] Nor is there any attempt to attribute to the ceremony any specifically Śaiva purpose or meaning. A work of public utility (_pūrtam_) after all is just that.

---

[672] *Devyāmata* f. 68r4: *dvibhujo rājadhānyāṃ tu pattane tu caturbhujaḥ | tathā cāṣṭabhujo bhadre praśastaḥ pattane sthitaḥ.*

[673] Thus in *Brahmayāmala* IFP 40.1–4b: *ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi pratimālakṣaṇaṃ param | navatālapramāṇena pratimāṃ kārayed budhaḥ || 2 śilāmayaṃ lohamayaṃ mṛṇmayaṃ vāpi kārayet | grāme cāṣṭabhujaṃ vidyān nagare ca caturbhujam || 3 vanāntare dvibhujaṃ vidyāt parvatāgre tu ṣoḍaśa | samudre dvādaśaṃ kuryāt *jandandya (?) …ṣaḍbhujam || 4 taṭāke daśabhujaṃ kuryāt catuṣpathe caturbhujam*; and *Brahmayāmala* Triv. 3.3–8: *grāme ca nagare caiva pattane rājadhānike | rakṣārthaṃ vāstavasthānaṃ pure vai kheṭakādiṣu || 4 sarvasādhāraṇaṃ vidyād yathāvibhavavistaram | bahiḥ prakārataḥ kuryān mātṛsthānaṃ tu vāstavam || 5 śreṣṭhaṃ pūrvottare bhāge śatadaṇḍānta'nantare | tadardhe vātha tasyārdhe daśadaṇḍāntare 'pi vā || 6 some syād vāstavaṃ brahman mātṝṇām iha coditam | pūrve vā paścime vāpi sthānam asya praśasyate || 7 yo me pūrvottare vāpi nagaragrāmaśobhitam | dakṣiṇe keṭakasyoktaṃ anyeṣāṃ prāci paścime || 8 āgneyanairṛtaiś caiva tṛtīyaṃ vāyugocaram | + + [i]tthaṃ praśaṃsanti yāmale śivabhāṣite.* On these south-Indian Yāmala texts, the cult they teach, and their non-brahmin priests see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 277–278 with footnotes 140–143.

[674] See EINOO 2002 for the details of these sources.

[675] A procedure of the Paurāṇika type is also taught in *Āśvalāyanīyagṛhyapariśiṣṭa* 4.9 and *Hiraṇyakeśigṛhyaśeṣasūtra* 1.7.1. (EINOO 2002, pp. 713–714).

[676] We find procedures based on the prescriptions of the *Matsyapurāṇa* in the ritual literature of the priests of the Kashmirian brahmins; see **Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā*, ff. 893r14–905v16 (*Varuṇapratiṣṭhā*); ff. 906r1–907v9 (the *Varuṇapratiṣṭhā* of Jīvana); 910r1–v1 (*Ādityapurāṇe Nālakapratiṣṭhā*); 929v7–931r8 (*Taḍākapratiṣṭhā* and *Nālakapratiṣṭhā*); and 931r9–931v23 (*Chandogapratiṣṭhātaḥ Kūpapratiṣṭhā*). These treatments do not appear to be distinctively Kashmirian. On the subject of the giving of wells and reservoirs and the Smārta/Paurāṇika procedures for consecrating them see also *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, vol. 1 (*Dānakhaṇḍa*), pp. 1001–1029.

[677] See *Somaśambhupaddhati*, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 392–403 and pp. 406–411. The first passage sets out the ritual for the consecration of a *puṣkariṇī*, but adds at its end that it applies also for the consecration of a *vāpī* or *taṭākaḥ*. The second passage gives the ritual for the consecration of a *kūpaḥ*. A *kūpaḥ* is a simple well, whereas a *vāpī* is a step-well, a well with a flight of steps leading down to it on one of more sides (*kūpo 'dvārako gartaviśeṣaḥ baddhasopānako 'yaṃ vāpīti dvaitanirṇayaḥ*: Raghunandana cited in KANE 2ii, p. 893). Such step-wells survive from the early medieval period, notably in Gujarat. The most splendid is no doubt the Rāṇī kī Vāv at Patan (Aṇahillapattana), the old Caulukya capital. Both a *puṣkariṇī* and a *taṭākaḥ* (/*taḍāgaḥ*) are water reservoirs. The difference appears to be one of scale alone, the latter being larger than the former. KANE (*loc. cit.*) reports the view expressed by Raghunandana in his *Jalāśayotsargatattva* that a *puṣkariṇī* is from 100 to 200 cubits in length, and a *taḍāgaḥ* is from 200 to 800, and the view of the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* as quoted by Raghunandana that a *puṣkariṇī* is up to 400 cubits in length and a *taḍāgaḥ* up to 2000.

[678] See *Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha (13th century, Benares), pp. 565–568 (11.1–28b); *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* of Vedajñānaguru II (16th century, Cidambaram), A, pp. 621–629, citing from the scripture *Cintyaviśvasādākhya* a passage obviously incorporated from the *Somaśambhupaddhati* (see BRUNNER 1998, p. 392, fn. 1); '*Kriyākramadyotikā*' MS transcript, pp. 344–346 (*Kūpapratiṣṭhā*); *Vīrāgama*, Paṭala 92. The section of the *Somaśambhupaddhati* on the consecration of reservoirs is also included in the Kashmirian **Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā* (ff. 907v10–908r9).

[679] See *Somaśambhupaddhati*, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 397–403 (vv. 8–19). Śaiva elements: the officiant recites the Pāśupatāstra Mantra as the patron crosses with the cow, makes oblations with the Aghora Mantra, instead of making an offering to the Vedic god Varuṇa may to do so to the Śaiva Vāmadeva, and after preparing a

That Śaiva officiants were engaged to perform the consecration of irrigation works undertaken by their royal patrons seems very likely. No inscription known to me records any such ritual, but then no inscription to my knowledge conveys information about any religious ceremonies that accompanied the inauguration of reservoirs and other such works. It is even more probable that the Śaiva version of the ritual would have been performed when Śaiva Gurus undertook such constructions in their own right. We have seen above that inscriptions record the creation of reservoirs by Vimalaśiva, Mūrtiśiva, Prabodhaśiva, Pataṅgaśiva, and Tribhuvanakartaradeva.

ŚAIVISM AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION

The fifth and last respect in which Śaivism can be seen to have played an active role is that of the assimilation of the communities that were caught up in the extension of the reach of the state that characterizes this period. For the Saiddhāntikas opened initiation to candidates from all four caste-classes,[680] including the Śūdras or at least the Sacchūdras or 'Pure Śūdras', those, that is, who had already succumbed to the values of brahmanical society to the extent that they had abjured alcohol,[681] a move that both promoted the penetration of these

---

porridge (_caruḥ_) with the Mantra of either makes the full oblation with the porridge using the Mantra of Śiva.

[680] Vaktraśambhu, _Mṛgendrapaddhativyākhyā_, p.188: _śrīmatpauṣkare 'pi: brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyāḥ śūdrāś caiva striyas tathā | *jaḍāndhabadhirā_ (em. : _jalāñāndhattrako_ Cod.) _mūkā dīkṣyāḥ *śaktipracoditāḥ_ (_śakti_ em. : _śaktha_ Cod.) 'And in the _Pauṣkara[pārameśvara]_: Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, women, imbeciles, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb: all should be initiated if they have been inspired by [Śiva's] power'; and _Raurava_ quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on _Mataṅgapārameśvara_, _Kriyāpāda_ 5.93 in support of the view that candidates for initiation should be brought before the Maṇḍala in the order of their castes: _yad uktaṃ śrīmadrauravādau: brāhmaṇān kṣatriyān vaiśyān śūdrāṃś caiva striyas tathā_ 'As has been taught in such scriptures as the _Raurava_: brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, and women'.

[681] _Parākhya_ cited by Trilocanaśiva in _Prāyaścittasamuccaya_, p.141: _yad uktaṃ śrīmatparākhye: kāryā dīkṣāpi sarveṣāṃ *tacchaktividhiyoginām_ (_tacchakti_ corr. : _tacchaktir_ Cod.) | _trayāṇām api varṇānāṃ na tu śūdrāntyajātiṣu | amadyapās tu ye śūdrāḥ śaivācārakriy*ādarāḥ_ (corr. : _ādirāḥ_ Cod.) | _śivabhaktāś *ca_ (corr. : _cai_ Cod.) _teṣāṃ sā dīkṣā *kāryānyathā na hīti_ (em. : _kāryannyathānuhīti_ Cod.) 'As has been taught in the _Parākhya_: 'Initiation should be done for all who have received the action of [the descent of] his power, for all three caste-classes but not for [ordinary] Śūdras and the lowest-born [below them]. One may initiate Śūdras, but only those who do not drink alcoholic liquor, who revere the disciplines and rites taught by Śiva, and are devoted to Śiva themselves'.

values and enabled the integration of the landowning agriculturalists, classed as Sacchūdras, that were dominant in the countryside both within and beyond the core territories of these expanding states. It thus provided a means of articulating a social unity that transcended the rigid exclusions of the brahmanical social order. Nor did it allow non-brahmins only to be initiated. More crucially it sanctioned their appointment as Ācāryas, restricting this licence only by requiring that persons could officiate for persons of none but their own or inferior caste-classes. Thus a brahmin could teach, initiate, and perform ceremonies of installation only for brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, a Kṣatriya only for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, a Vaiśya only for Vaiśyas and Śūdras, and a Śūdra only for others of his caste-class.[682] The key groups here appear to have been the first and the last. For there is little evidence of the presence of Vaiśya traders in Śaivism, and though, as we have seen, Kṣatriya rulers were commonly Śaiva initiates, their social status and function were obviously incompatible with pontifical office. The core social structure here is one of brahmin Gurus initiating other brahmins, Kṣatriyas rulers, and perhaps on occasion members of lower castes, and of Śūdra Gurus initiating both other Śūdras and the powerful in their communities, who though kṣatriya-like in their local authority[683] were nonetheless formally of the same caste-class as their initiators. The Śāstric formulation of the full set of possibilities, in which members of any caste-class are said to be able to initiate only their equals and inferiors, serves, I suggest, not as a record that all these possibilities were enacted but rather as an abstraction that adds authority to the more restricted common practice by presenting it as following a universally valid principle upheld in the brahmanical social system, seen, for example in the rule that a man may marry a woman born of parents of his own caste or one below it but never a woman from a community ranked above him.[684] Indeed Saiddhāntika texts that discuss who may receive initiation and consecration and who may not include the offspring of such forbidden marriages in the latter category.[685]

---

[682] _Kiraṇa_ f. [60]v2–3 (38.4–5): _caturṇām api varṇānāṃ_ (em. : _catuvarṇṇāpivarṇṇānṃṃ_ Cod.) _ācāryatvam ihoditam | brāhmaṇādicatuṣkasya dvijo 'nugrahakṛd bhavet | kṣatriyāditrikaṃ yac ca *kṣatriyo *dīkṣito_ (corr. : _dīkṣitod_ Cod.) _guruḥ | vaiśyādidvitayaṃ vaiśyaḥ śūdraḥ śūdrān tu dīkṣayet_. In this [system] the office of Ācārya has been taught for all four caste-classes. A brahmin may initiate persons of tue four beginning with his, an initiated Kṣatriya Guru the three beginning with his, and a Vaiśya the two beginning with his. A Śūdra may initiate [only] Śūdras'.

[683] _Parākhya_ quoted in _Dīkṣādarśa_ A, p. 26; B, p. 42: _*amadyapāḥ_ (em. : _amadyapa_ A : _amādyapa_ B) _*kulīnāś_ (corr. : _kulīnaś_ A : _kūlinañ_ B) _ca nityadharma*parāyaṇāḥ_ (em. : _parāyaṇaḥ_ AB) | _*śūdrāḥ_ (em. : _śūdra_ AB) _kṣatriyavaj jñeyāś śeṣā nindyā<s> tato bhṛśam_ 'Those Śūdras who do not drink alcohol, who are of good family, and devoted to the obligatory religious duties should be looked upon as Kṣatriyas. All the rest are completely to be condemned'. Cf. _Pārameśvara_ f. 3v2–3: _*amadyapās_ (em. : _amedhyapās_ Cod.) _tu ye śūdrā<ḥ> śau[cā]cārasamanvitāḥ | rudrabhaktās tu teṣān tu bhojyam annam prakīrtitam_ 'One is permitted to accept food from those Śūdras who do not drink alcohol, who observe the rules of purity, and are devotees of Śiva'; Trilocanaśiva, _Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā_, p. 84: _tad uktaṃ brahmaśambhupaddhatau "brahmakṣatriyaviśāṃ bhikṣāṃ *abhiśastādivarjitām_ (em. : _abhiśabdādivarjitām_ Cod.) | _amadyapās tu ye śūdrāḥ śaucācārasamanvitāḥ | teṣām eva cared bhikṣā nānyeṣāṃ tu kadācana" iti_ "That has been taught in the _Paddhati_ of Brahmaśambhu in the following: "One may gather alms only from brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, provided it is not from someone who been condemned [for some sin] or [permanently excluded from his caste], and also from such Śūdras as do not drink alcohol and observe the rules of purity. One may never accept alms from others"'.

Evidence of the existence of such self-contained Śūdra Saiddhāntika lineages is abundant in the Tamil country at the end of our period and after it down to modern times. There members of the Sacchūdra Veḷḷāḷa community such as Meykaṇṭār, and Ñāṉacampantar played a significant part in the development of the canon of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, and a good number of powerful Maṭhas emerged, such as those at Tarumapuram (Dharmapuram) and Tiruvāḍuturai, in which the presiding ascetics were and have continued to be members of this upwardly mobile Sacchūdra caste.[686]

---

[684] See, e.g., *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, *Ācārādhyāya* 57, 91–95.

[685] *Dīkṣādarśa* · A, p. 23; B, p. 25: *atrādhikāri*tvanirūpaṇavidhir* (corr. : *nirūpaṇatvavidhir* Codd.) *ucyate | viprādīnāṃ daśānāṃ gurutvam uktam | tathā cintyaviśve "viprādiṣu caturṣu evam anulomādiṣu ṣaṭsu ca | eteṣāṃ daśajātīnām ācāryatvaṃ vidhīyate" | tathā kāmike "catvāro brāhmaṇādyāś ca anulomāś ca ye matāḥ"* 'I shall [now] explain how one determines who is competent for this [office]. Ten, beginning with the brahmin, can be Gurus. Thus in the *Cintyaśiva*: "It is ruled that these ten castes may be Ācāryas: the four beginning with brahmin, and the six Anulomas". And in the *Kāmika*: "The four beginning with the brahmin and the [six] Anulomas"'. The term Anuloma here is a synonym of *anulomajaḥ* 'born of a union that is in the natural direction', that is to say, hypergamous. The six Anulomas are (1) from a brahmin man and Kṣatriya woman (Mūrdhāvasikta), (2) from a brahmin man and Vaiśya woman (Ambaṣṭha), (3) from a brahmin man and Śūdra woman (Pāraśava); (4) from a Kṣatriya man and a Vaiśya woman (Māhiṣya/Madgu), (5) from a Kṣatriya man and a Śūdra woman (Ugra), and (6) from a Vaiśya man and a Śūdra woman (Karaṇa). See, e.g., *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, *Ācārādhyāya* 91–92. The *-ādi-* in *anulomādiṣu ṣaṭsu ca* in the passage cited from the *Cintyaviśva* is redundant and may be corrupt (perhaps for *anulomātmasu*).

[686] *ARE* 1909, p. 105; STEIN 1994, pp. 235–241; GHOSE 1996, pp. 222, 253–282. STEIN hypothesizes (1994, pp. 237–239) that this rise of the Veḷḷāḷas was the cause of the fact that from the thirteenth century onwards independent shrines of the Goddess (*kāmakoṣṭham*) began to be built in the Tamil area alongside those of Śiva and to be enclosed with the latter in a single architectural complex. He takes this to be evidence of "the assimilation of folk conceptions of deity". See also GHOSE 1996, pp. 221–222. There is certainly widespread evidence of Śāktization in the later south-Indian Śaiva literature. In the south-Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures *Raurava*, *Cintya*, *Makuṭa*, and *Sūkṣma* all the male deities in the circuits surrounding

It might be suspected that this is an isolated development pecular to the Far South; and I must say that I am not yet aware of historical evidence of parallel developments elsewhere in India at this time or before it. However, it is extremely improbable that we would have found unambiguous statements in early texts that are very unlikely to have emanated from that region to the effect that Śūdras may receive consecration as Ācāryas, initiate others of their caste and pass on their office within it, if this was not indeed a widespread practice. This is all the more certain in the light of the fact that the same early corpus provides specific instructions on how such initiates should be named, how they should dress their hair, mark themselves with ash, and the like.[687]

Śiva in temple worship, from the first of the Brahmas to the last of the Weapons have been provided with a personal Śakti; see *Raurava*, *Kriyāpāda*, Paṭala 59. and N.R. BHATT's introduction to his edition of the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*, pp. xviii-xix (*Cintya* and *Makuṭa*) and pp. lxviii-lxix (*Cintya*, *Makuṭa*, and *Sūkṣma*). There is striking evidence of a related development in the Tamil Śaiva literature in the *Tirumantiram* of Tirumūlar. That text has been assigned to the fifth, sixth. and seventh centuries. But it weaves together the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, the Vedānta, a Śākta tradition that features *kuṇḍalinīyogaḥ* and the cult of Tripurā, and the cult of Naṭarāja. This is a combination which is unlikely to predate the twelfth century (see also GOODALL 2004, pp. xxix–xxx). In Sanskrit the same amalgam appears in such works as the scripture *Jñānasiddhyāgama* and the *Siddhāntapaddhati* of a Jñānaśiva.

[687] *Sarvajñānottara* A f. 35r3–5 (14.35–40), B pp. 99–100 (*Liṅgoddhārādiprakaraṇa* vv. 34c–40b): *āpādamastakaṃ yāva bhasmasnānaṃ dvijasya tu | nābher ūrdhvaṃ nṛpasyoktam āraktena tu bhasmanā || 36 vaiśyasya paṭṭikā proktā śūdrasya tu tripuṇḍrakam | bhasmanā brahmajaptena yathā*sthānair* (A : *sthāneṣu* B) *anukramāt || 37 brāhmaṇasya jaṭā<ḥ> *sūkṣmā<ḥ>* (A : *ślaṣṇā* B) *kanakāḥ parikīrtitāḥ | sthūlās taddviguṇā jñeyā kṣatriyasya tu vyantarāḥ || 38 vaiśyasyaikā śikhāsthāne tathā śūdrasya kīrtitā | hrasvā ślakṣṇ*ākṣasaṃyuktāḥ* (*ākṣa* A : *ānu* B) *saṃyatasya *jitendriya* (conj. : *jitendriyaḥ* Codd.) *|| 39 *yajñopavītaṃ sautraṃ* (A : *yajñopavītasūtraṃ* B) *tu vipre pañcasaraṃ smṛtam | trisaraṃ kṣatriyasyoktaṃ vaiśyasya dvisaraṃ smṛtam || 40 śūdrasyaikasaraṃ jñeyaṃ nityam avyabhicāriṇaḥ | *arcāgnikāryakāle tu* (A : *arcāyām agnikārye vā* B) *saṃdhyākāle ca nānyathā* 'A brahmin's bath with ashes should be from foot to head. A Kṣatriya's has been taught to be from the navel up and with reddish ash. A Vaiśya may have only a broad band [of ash] on his forehead. A Śūdra may make the Tripuṇḍraka marks with ash on the various prescribed points on the body in the [prescribed] order[. In each the bath should be done] with ash empowered by the [five] Brahma[mantra]s. A brahmin's braids should be narrow and [of the round variety,] called 'thorn apples' (*kanakāḥ*). A Kṣatriya's should be twice as thick *... (?). A Vaiśya should have only one braid, on the crown of his head. It should be short, smooth, with a Rudrākṣa bead attached. The same applies to a Śūdra ascetic, *O you of controlled senses (?). The sacred thread should always have five strands for a brahmin, three for a Kṣatriya, two for a Vaiśya, and one for an observant Śūdra. The last, however, may wear it only when doing Pūjā, making offerings into the sacrificial fire, and during the periods of the junctures of the day'; *Kiraṇa* f. [60]r3–4 (37.10, 12–13): *upavītaṃ *bhaved* (corr. : *bhavedd* Cod.) *evaṃ kṣatriyāditrayasya tu | trisaraṃ dvisaram vāpi kāryam ekasaraṃ kramāt || 12 pūjātanmātrakaṃ kālaṃ nordhvaṃ*

As for those below the Pure Śūdras, that is to say, members of Śūdra castes not considered pure and, below even them, members of the various more or less untouchable communities defined as the lowest-born (*antyajāḥ*), these too were drawn by the Saiddhāntikas within the reach of the religion. Texts of this tradition declare that a Guru is forbidden to give them initiation in the full sacrificial form (*hautrī dīkṣā*). But if he sees that they are inspired by sincere devotion to Śiva he is required to perform for them a simplified form of initiation that avoids direct contact. This is to be accomplished mentally (*mānasī dīkṣā*) or in the form of a gaze believed to transmit Śiva's liberating power (*cākṣuṣī dīkṣā*), or by allowing them to drink the water with which his feet have been washed, an extension of the common devotional practice of drinking the water that gathers at the foot of an image in the course of its worship.[688]

---

*teṣāṃ bhaved iha | jaṭānāṃ dhāraṇaṃ *bhasmalepanaṃ* (corr. : *bhasmaṃlepanaṇa* Cod.) **brāhmaṇe* (corr. : *brahmaṇe* Cod.) *bhavet* || 13 *tripuṇḍraka<ṃ> śikhā caikā kṣatriyāditraye bhavet* 'This is how the sacred thread should be [for a brahmin]. But for Kṣatriyas and the rest it should be made with three, two, and one strand respectively and may be worn only at the time of worship, not after. A brahmin [only] may wear [full] braids and smear [his whole body] with ashes. The three [castes] beginning with Kṣatriyas may have a Tripuṇḍraka and a single [braid at the] crown'; *Mṛgendra*, *Caryāpāda* 1.3–4a: *vratino jaṭilā muṇḍās teṣu agryā bhasmapāṇḍarāḥ | tilakaiḥ puṇḍrakaiḥ paṭṭair bhūṣitā bhūmipādayaḥ | jaṭā na śūdro bibhṛyāt* 'Ascetics [should either] have their hair in braids or be shaven bald. The foremost among them[, the brahmins,] should be white with ash [from head to foot]. Kṣatriyas[, Vaiśyas,] and [Śūdras] should be adorned with dots [of ash], Vaiśyas with the [Tri]puṇḍraka lines, and Śūdras with a broad band [of ash on the forehead]. A Śūdra may not wear braids'. For the differentiation of initiation-names according to caste see here p. 291.

[688] *Kiraṇa* f. [60]v3–4 (38.6c–7): *yathāsthitena bhāvena *mantrāḥ* (em. : *mantra* Cod.) *kurvanty anugraham* || *yatas tato *'ntyajasyasyāpi* (conj. : *ntyajasyāsyāsya* Cod.) *dīkṣā *kiṃ tu atra* (em. : *kintatra* Cod.) *mānasī | kārukānāṃ tu saṃsparśā<n> *na tu hautrīṃ* (em. : *nugrahautrī* Cod.) *prakalpayet* 'Since Mantras grant initiation in consideration [only] of the state of [a person's] mentality he may give initiation even to an untouchable. But [the initiation] in this case [must be only] through the medium of the mind. It the case of workmen [it should be] by touching them. He must not do the initiation involving fire-sacrifice [for either]'; *Kāmika* quoted in the *Dīkṣādarśa* A, p. 27 and B, p. 43: *antyajānāṃ na hautrī syāt kiṃ tu dīkṣā tu cākṣuṣī* 'Untouchables may not receive initiation through fire-sacrifice. But they can receive ocular initiation'; *Vāyavyasaṃhitā* quoted in the *Dīkṣādarśa* A, p. 26 and B, p. 41: *asacchūdrāntyajātīnāṃ patitānāṃ viśeṣataḥ | tathā saṃkarajātīnāṃ nādhvaśuddhir vidhīyate | te 'py akṛtrimabhāvāś cec chive paramakāraṇe | pādodakapradānādyaiḥ kuryāt *pāśaviśodhanam* (A : *pāduviśodhanam* B) *| atrānulomajātā ye *yuktā ye* (em. : *yuktaye* AB) **vā* (A : *va* B) *dvijātiṣu | teṣām adhvaviśuddhyādi *kāryam atra* (em. : *kāryamātra* AB) **kulocitam* (A : *kulojitam* B) 'The elimination of the paths [of the universe through oblations in the sacrificial fire] is not permited for Impure Śūdras, untouchables (*antyajāti-*), and, above all, for outcastes (*patita-*), nor for those of the mixed castes (*saṃkarajāti-*). If[, however,] they have genuine devotion to Śiva, the highest cause,

Orthodox brahmanical practice denied all Śūdras access through Upanayana to the Veda and the rituals that are animated by its Mantras and excluded even more radically the various groups it ranked below these as 'the lowest born' (*antyajaḥ*, *antyajātiḥ*). The texts of the Śaivas justified their liberating inroads into the mass of humanity beyond these brahmanical boundaries by boldly declaring that the system of the separation of the castes (*jātibhedaḥ*) is a fabrication without basis in reality, a cultural epiphenomenon rather than a deep fact of nature,[689] pointing to its absence among human beings outside of India.[690] Only mentality matters; and consequently all devotees of Śiva form a single community regardless of birth,[691] one whose only true internal

---

he should eliminate their bonds by such means as giving them the water from his feet. As for those who are born of inter-caste marriages in which the father's caste is higher or *if they are connected with brahmins (?) he may do [for them the full ritual procedure] that begins with the elimination of the paths as appropriate to the [caste of the] family [in which they have been born]'. The term *saṃkarajātiḥ*, which I have translated literally as 'of the mixed castes' refers to offspring of such unions as that between a Māhiṣya (born of a Kṣatriya man and Vaiśya woman) and Karaṇa woman (born of a Vaiśya man and Śūdra woman; see, e.g., *Mitākṣarā* on *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, *Ācārādhyāya* 95.

[689] *Pauṣkarapārameśvara* quoted in *Nityādisaṃgraha* f. 62v12–13: *manuṣyajātir ekaiva* 'There is only one caste, that of human beings'; f. 63r4–5: *na jātir vihitā tatra varṇaṃ vāpi sitādikam | yoniliṅgodbhavāḥ sarve jīva ekaḥ samaḥ sthitaḥ | tatra sarvagato devo dṛśyate jñānacakṣuṣā | ajñāna*dhvastacittānāṃ* (conj. : *pāpacittānāṃ* Cod.) *kuśāstra*vivaśātmanām* (conj. : *vihitātmanām* Cod.) *| vākpralāpaḥ sthitas teṣāṃ yadi jātiḥ prayojanam* 'No caste has been enjoined with respect to them, nor colour such as white. All are born from sexual union and the souls [of all] are equal. With the eye of knowledge Śiva is seen pervading all of them. If [they declare that] caste is relevant then this is the prattling of men whose understanding is destroyed by ignorance, who are under the sway of false teachings'; *Kulasāra* f. 72r2: *ekabījaprasūtaṃ hi sarvaṃ jagad idaṃ priye | tasmāj jātivicāraṃ tu bhrāntipūrvam idaṃ kṛtam* 'This whole world, my beloved, has been born from a single seed. So this concern for caste that people have springs from an error'; *Tantrāloka* 15.595c–601b.

[690] *Cintyaviśva[sādākhya]* quoted in *Dīkṣādarśa* of Vedajñānaguru II, A, p. 24; B, p. 38: *navakhaṇḍeṣu sarveṣu bhārateṣu *mayena ca* (B : *ca yena ca* A) *| jātibhedam idaṃ kalpyam anyadeśeṣu nāsti tat | tasmāt tat kalpanāmātraṃ jātibhedam *iti kramam* (?) 'Maya [the Guru of the Asuras] created this division of the castes throughout the nine divisions of the continent of Bharata. It does not exist in other countries. Therefore it is nothing but a fabrication/fiction.'

[691] See, for example, *Niśvāsakārikā*, pp. 35–36 (12.161–167): 161 *tattvāni yo vijānāti tattvānāṃ *vyāptim uttamām* (em. : *vyāptir uttamam* Cod.) *| dharmādharmān na lipyeta sa sarvānugrahe kṣamaḥ* || 162 *brāhmaṇa<ḥ> kṣatriyo *vaiśyaḥ* (corr. : *veśyaḥ* Cod.) *śūdro vā tattvavid yadā | *vibhaktir* (em. : *vibhaktiṃ* Cod.) *naiva vidyeta yathāgnāv agnir eva hi* || 163 *kṣīraṃ kṣīre yathā nyasto toye toyam ivārpitam | vibhāgo naiva vidyeta tattvam īśvara*bhāṣitam* (conj. : *īśvarabhāvitam* Cod.) || 164 *yathā hi saritas sarvās sāgarāśrayasaṃsthitāḥ | *vivektuṃ* (em. : *vivekan* Cod.) *tu na śakyante rasa*bhāve* (conj. : *bhāvaṃ* Cod.) *pṛthak pṛthak* || 165 *tadvad varṇāśramā devi dīkṣito yadi vā paśuḥ | śivabhāvasamā*yuktās*

hierarchy is that created by the four levels of empowerment through initiation and consecration.[692]

However, it should not be imagined that because they insisted that the divisions of the castes are ultimately groundless when explaining the inclusiveness of their recruitment they rejected these divisions in practice. It is one thing to extend one's recuitment into lower social strata and quite another to reject the divisions between them in practice. Thus in spite of their rhetoric of the underlying unity of man they required that caste divisions be respected not only in relations between initiates and the wider society in matters such as marriage but also in relations between fellow-initiates. As we have seen, they denied impure Śūdras and untouchables the full ceremonial form of initiation, they refused to transmit the office of Ācārya to the offspring of unions between a man of a lower caste and a women of a higher, and they would not countenance an Ācārya's initiating his caste superior, in effect a Śūdra's initiating a brahmin. They also required, for example, that when initiates of different caste-classes gathered they should sit apart, each in a separate line;[693] the penances (*prāyaścittam*) that they prescribed for initiates contaminated by an accidental or wilful contact with a person in a state of impurity were calibrated in severity according the degree of distance in caste-status between the persons contaminating and contaminated;[694] and they assigned compound initiation-names such as Aghora-śiva and Aghora-gaṇa whose second member indicated the caste-status of the bearer, marking out brahmins from non-brahmins, non-Śūdras from Śūdras, or each of the four caste-classes from each other.[695]

(conj. : *yukto* Cod.) **tulyā* (conj. : *tulyam* Cod.) *eva na saṃśayaḥ* || 166 *śivatantraṃ samāśritya vibhaktiṃ yaḥ kariṣyati* | **pacyen naraḥ sa* (conj. : *sa pacyen naro* Cod.) *ghoreṣu dvātriṃśan narakeṣu ca* || 167 *brahmaṇas tu dināḥ pañca dināḥ pañca ca keśave* | *dinatrayaṃ tu rudrasya prāyaścittīyate naraḥ*; Vāladhārin, *Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati* f. 49r4–v1, extending this principle to include foreigners (better to initiate a sincere Mleccha than an insincere brahmin): *māyānvito yadā śiṣyo viprajātisamudbhavaḥ* | *māyāhīnas tataḥ pātraṃ mlecchaśūdrādisaṃbhavaḥ* || *na vipre dāpayed dīkṣāṃ dāpayen mlecchajanmine* | *nādhikārī yato vipro māyādiguṇasaṃyutaḥ* || *niṣprapañcaguṇair yukto mlecchaś caiva śivāgame* | *dīkṣā vai sarvathā tasya yato māyāvivarjitaḥ*. See the same point made in the lost scripture *Mukuṭa* cited by Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 15.514cd.

[692] *Nityādisaṃgraha* f. 63r11–12: *taponibaddho yair ātmā brāhmaṇāṃs tān vidur janāḥ* | *paśupāśavidhānajñāḥ śivajñānānusāriṇaḥ* | *te hi devātidevasya pūjākarmaṇi kīrtitāḥ* | *ity uktaṃ candrahāsākhye mukuṭādyāgameṣu ca samayyādiviśeṣeṇa jātir ekaiva kīrtitā* 'People judge as [true] brahmins those who have controlled themselves through austerity, who know the bound soul, the bonds, and the rites [of initiation], and who follow the teachings of Śiva. For it is these that have been declared [fit to officiate] in the rites of the worship of the Supreme Deity. This has been taught in the [scripture] *Candrahāsa*'; and in such texts as the *Mukuṭa* we are told that there is only one 'caste' [for Śaivas] with differentiation [by status] only into Samayins[, Putrakas, Sādhakas,] and [Ācāryas]'.

[693] Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1961, p. 301 (v. 8cd.): *savarṇair ekayā paṅktyā bhuñjītāntarmanāmuniḥ* 'One should eat in silence with concentrate mind in a single line with others of the same caste-class'; Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, p. 25: *ekapaṅktiḥ sadā varjyā bhojane bhinnajātibhiḥ* 'When eating one must always avoid sitting in a single line with persons of other castes'. Note the distaste expressed by the brahmin Saṃkarṣaṇa in the *Āgamaḍambara* (p. 56) when, in a Kashmirian monastery, he notices that Buddhist monks do not form separate lines according to caste when they eat together: *catvāro varṇā varṇasaṃkarā api vā sarva evaikasyāṃ paṅktau bhuñjate* 'Persons of all the four caste-classes and even from the mixed castes are eating together in a single line'.

[694] See Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 25. Similar differentiation according to caste applies to the penances for eating the leavings of another's food (*ucchiṣṭabhojanam*), illicit sexual intercourse, and the taking of human life; see ibid., pp. 32, 35, 48, and 52–53. How the hierarchy of caste was perceived in relation to that between the initiated and the uninitiated can be seen in the rules for the penances needed to restore purity if one's food has been contaminated through contact with an *ucchiṣṭaḥ*, a person who has eaten but has not yet purified himself. The rules for initiated brahmins will suffice to illustrate this. If a brahmin initiate's food is contaminated by another brahmin initiate the penance is 100 repetitions of the Tatpuruṣa, the Mantra that is the Lord of his Caste (*jātīśaḥ*). It is doubled if the contaminator is an uninitiated brahmin or an initiated Kṣatriya. One day of fasting is added to the repetitions if the contaminator is an uninitiated Kṣatriya, two if the contaminator is an initiated Vaiśya, three if an initiated Śūdra, four if an uninitiated Vaiśya, and six if an uninitiated Śūdra (ibid., p. 31). Here we see traces of a view that the status bestowed by Śaiva initiation should prevail over that of caste. In its pure form this would entail that a Śaiva brahmin should consider contamination by an initiated Śūdra one degree less severe than that by an uninitiated brahmin, two degrees less severe than that by an uninitiated Kṣatriya, and so on. But the Saiddhāntikas have preferred to limit the application of this view to the lowest two castes, where it was of least consequence, allowing an initiated Śūdra to be less contaminating than an uninitiated Vaiśya, but not a initiated Vaiśya to outrank an uninitiated Kṣatriya or an initiated Kṣatriya an ordinary brahmin. In other words the primary distinctions here are (1) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas on the one hand and Vaiśyas and Śūdras on the other, and (2) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas. So while a Śūdra will be purer than a Vaiśya if he has been initiated, a Kṣatriya, in effect the king or a member of his family, will never be less pure than a Vaiśya, nor a brahmin less pure than a non-brahmin. In this regard the benefit of initiation in the case of the Kṣatriya is limited to an acceptance that he is no more contaminating than an uninitiated brahmin. But this is already a major concession in terms of caste and articulates the view seen elsewhere in the literature that the prosperity of society requires an alliance between the brahmins led by the Śaivas and a monarch who has received initiation from the Śaiva Guru. This view is underlined by the fact that penance is without fasting in the case of contamination by brahmins or an initiated Kṣatriya but with fasting in all other cases.

[695] I am aware of five different rulings in this matter. (1) names in -śiva, etc. for brahmins only, in -gaṇa for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and in -śakti for women; see *Kiraṇa* 37.11–12b: *kṣatriyāditrayasyoktam <m>antranāma gaṇāṅkitam* || 12 *viprāṇāṃ *mantrapūrvaṃ* (conj. : *mātupūrvvan* Cod) *tu sagotrāntam bhaved iha* 'In the case of the three [castes] beginning with the Kṣatriya it should be the name of one of the Mantras distinguished by [the addition of] -gaṇa. In the case of brahmins

However, the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the worship of Bhairava and the Goddess in the Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha have shown themselves much less willing to tolerate such compromises, seeing them as a contamination of the true Śaiva tradition and appropriate only for those, namely the Saiddhāntikas, whose degree of illumination by Śiva is insufffficient to enable them to appreciate and enact his higher teachings.[696] Distinction on the basis of caste is generally

---

it should begin with a Mantra and end with the Gotra name [-śiva, etc.]'; *Mṛgendra, Kriyāpāda* 8.60c–61: *srajaṃ vimocayen nāma dīkṣitānāṃ tadādikam* ‖ *śivāntakaṃ dvijendrānām itareṣāṃ gaṇāntakam* 'He should throw the garland. The names of initiated brahmins should begin with [the name of] that [on which it lands] and end in -śiva. For all others it should end in -gaṇa; 'and *Vidyāpurāṇa*, a Saiddhāntika scripture in spite of its title, quoted in *Nityādisaṃgraha* f. 63v12– 64r13: *śivo jyotiḥ śikhā caiva sāvitraś ceti gocarāḥ* | ... *etāḥ saṃjñā dvijāgryāṇāṃ rājādīnāṃ gaṇāṅkitāḥ* | *śaktisaṃjñās tu *vai* (em: *vā*) *strīṇāṃ sarvāsāṃ parikīrtitāḥ* 'The gocaras are Śiva, Jyoti, Śikhā and Sāvitra. ...These names [ending in -śiva, -jyotis etc.] are proper to brahmins. The names of Kṣatriyas[, Vaiśyas] and [Śūdras] are distinguished by the [ending] -gaṇa, while all women are required to have names [ending] in -śakti'; (2) a Kashmirian tradition in which names in -śiva are for the three higher caste-classes, with names in -gaṇa for Śūdras only, and names in -śakti for women; see Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mṛgendra, Kriyāpāda* 8.60c–61 cited above, taking *dvijendrāṇāṃ* there to mean not brahmins but brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas; Jayaratha, *Tantrālokaviveka* on 4.265ab (adding names in -śakti for women); Manoda, *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* A ff. 96v16–97r9: *tatpātāvasare śivanāmāṅkitaṃ śiṣyaṃ vidhāya striyaṃ ca śaktināmāṅkitāṃ vidhāya ...śūdraviṣaye tu ayam amukagaṇa āgataḥ iti prayojyam* 'When that [flower] falls he should name a male disciple -śiva and a woman -śakti. ...In the case of a Śūdra he should formulate [the Mantra] as follows: 'This man, N-gaṇa, has come [before you, O Lord]'; (3) names in -śiva for brahmins, and in -gaṇa and -deva for Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas; see Brahmaśambhu, *Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna* f. 38v4–5 (2.180): *tatpātasūcitasthānapūrvaṃ śivapadottaraṃ* | *nāmāvadhārya viprasya gaṇadevāntam anyayoḥ* 'Having determined the [initiation] name, whose first part should be the * ...(?) indicated by the fall of the [flower] and whose second part should be the word -śiva in the case of a brahmin, but which should end in -gaṇa and -deva in the case of the other two [castes]'; *Amṛteśadīkṣāvidhi* f. 16r6–7: *śiṣyasya nāmakaraṇaṃ śivāmaragaṇāntakam*; (4) names in -śiva for brahmins, and in -deva, -gaṇa, and -muni for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras; see *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, Kriyāpāda* 146 (16.67–68b): *śivāntaṃ brāhmaṇasya syād devagaṇāntam anyayoḥ* | *śūdrasya muniśabdāntaṃ nāma kuryād* 'The name of a brahmin should end in -śiva and those of the next two [castes, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya] in -gaṇa and -deva. He should give a Śūdra a name that ends in -muni'; and (5) names in -śiva for brahmins, -kavaca for Kṣatriyas, -deva for Vaiśyas, and -gaṇa for Śūdras; see *Bṛhatkālottara* A, f. 91v3–4: *śivasaṃjñā dvijasyaiva kavacākhyā nṛpasya ca* | *vaiśyānāṃ devasaṃjñā ca śūdrānāṃ ca *gaṇāntakam* (em. : *gaṇāntikam* Cod.) | *puṣpapātānusāreṇa saṃjñā *tatpātato* (conj. : *tatpātrato* Cod.) *hitā* 'The [initiation] name should be -śiva for a brahmin, -kavaca for a Kṣatriya, -deva for Vaiśyas, and ending in -gaṇa for Śūdras. The [first half of the] name should be in accordance with the throwing of the flower [on to a Maṇḍala], being determined by [segment of] the [Maṇḍala] in which it lands'.

[696] *Tantrāloka* 15.517: *ata evārthasattattvadeśiny asmin na diśyate* | *rahasyaśāstre jātyādisamācāro hi śāmbhave* 'In this esoteric [Śākta/Kaula] Śaiva system, since it teaches the nature of the ultimately real, observance of such [distinctions] as [those of] caste is not taught'.

allowed to intrude only at the point of entry, to determine the length of the period during which a Guru should examine a candidate to determine his or her fitness for initiation, or in the *Mahālakṣmīmata* that ends the fourth *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala* to enable a Guru to select the impure substance that the candidate will be given to swallow without inhibition before receiving consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*):[697]

> Although there is no division of castes in this great Tantra, it is found nonetheless, O beautiful-eyed, in the commencement of initiation. [For only] when people have gone through initiation do they have no caste at all. [Or rather only then] do they become members of the one 'caste' of Śiva. For this reason, in the Viseṣadīkṣā [the Ācārya] must do what I shall now explain. Slender-waisted one, he should initiate brahmins by making them drink wine, Kṣatriyas by [making them drink] urine, Vaiśyas by making them drink semen, Śūdras by [making them swallow] faeces, and women by making them embrace the body of an initiate.

We find accordingly a stronger rejection of caste in ceremonial contexts, a conviction that pride of caste is one of the factors that hold souls in bondage, and prohibitions against ever mentioning the birth-caste of a fellow initiate. Thus in the *Svacchandatantra* of the Mantrapīṭha we read:[698]

> O fair-faced one, all those who have been initiated by this ritual are of equal nature, whether they be brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, or others [of lower castes]. [For] they have been brought into a state of fusion with the nature of Śiva. All are said to be [Śivas,] wearers of [his] braids, their bodies dusted [like his] with ash. All Samayins should sit in a single row. Putrakas, Sādhakas,

---

[697] *Jayadrathayāmala, Ṣaṭka*, f. 230v4–6: *yady apy asmin mahātantre jātibhedo na vidyate* ‖ 33 *tathāpi dīkṣāprārambhe bhavaty eva sulocane* | *dīkṣitānāṃ na jātiḥ syād ekā jātis tu caiśvarī* ‖ 34 *tasmād viśeṣadīkṣāyāṃ *vakṣyamāṇaṃ* (corr. : *vakṣyamāṇāṃ* Cod.) *samācaret* | *brāhmaṇā<ṃ>ś *cālipānena* (em. : *cālipātena* Cod.) **kṣatriyāṃś* (em. : *kṣatriyaś* Cod.) *ca śivāmbunā* ‖ 35 *vaiśyā<ṃ>ś candanapānena śūdrā<n> vai viśvabhasmanā* | *striyo vīrāṅgasaṃsparśā<d> dīkṣayeta sumadhyame.*

[698] *Svacchanda* 4.539c–545: *anenaiva vidhānena dīkṣitā ye varānane* ‖ 540 *brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyāḥ śūdrāś cānye 'thavā priye* | *sarve te samadharmāṇaḥ śivadharme niyojitāḥ* ‖ 541 *sarve jaṭādharāḥ proktā bhasmoddhūlitavigrahāḥ* | *ekapaṅktibhujaḥ sarve samayinas tu varānane* ‖ 542 *putrakāṇāṃ bhaved ekā sādhakānāṃ tathā bhavet* | *cumbakānāṃ bhaved ekā na prāgjātivibhedataḥ* ‖ 543 *ekaiva sā smṛtā jātir bhairavīyā śivāvyayā* | *tantram etat samāśritya prāgjātiṃ na hy udīrayet* ‖ 544 *putrakāṇāṃ sādhakānāṃ tathā samayināṃ api* | *prāgjātyudīraṇād devi prāyaścittī bhaven naraḥ* ‖ 545 *dinatrayaṃ tu rudrasya pañcāhaṃ keśavasya ca* | *pitāmahasya pakṣaikaṃ narake pacyate tu saḥ* ‖ 545 *avivekī bhavet tasmād yadīcched uttamāṃ siddhim* | *avivekena deveśi siddhir muktir dhruvaṃ bhavet.* This passage is related to *Niśvāsakārikā* 12.161–167 cited above, p. 289.

> and Cumbakas [Ācāryas] should do the same. They may not sit according to the divisions of their former castes. [For] they are said to form but a single caste of Bhairava, auspicious and eternal. Once a person has taken up this Tantric system he may never mention his former caste. If any [initiate] mentions the former caste of any Putraka, Sādhaka, or Samayin he will have sinned and will be roasted in hell for three days of the life of Rudra, five of the life of Viṣṇu, and fifteen of the life of Brahmā. So, if he aspires to the highest Siddhi he must make no [such] discriminatory distinctions. O Empress of the Gods, it is [only] through [this] freedom from discimination that one will certainly attain both Siddhi and liberation.

Rituals involving the participation of people of all castes, especially those considered untouchable, is a marked feature here;[699] and while the Saiddhāntikas were in general prepared to descend in the giving of full initiation only as far as members of those communities classed as Sacchūdra, the Śākta Śaivas had no such reservations, opening such initiation even to those that brahmanism considered untouchable. As evidence that such initiations were not merely prescribed, for such prescriptions might be more rhetorical than intended to support actual common practice, we have the testimony of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on the Saiddhāntika *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*, addressing a verse in that scripture that might but for his learned intervention be taken to mean that Saiddhāntikas like himself are wrong to draw the line at the Sacchūdras. Indeed his Śākta Śaiva near-contemporary and fellow Kashmirian Abhinavagupta cites this verse as compelling evidence that Śiva has allowed elements of the non-dualistic, caste-transcending view of the Śāktas to shine through even in this dualistic stratum of his revelation:[700]

> It is for this reason that even in these [dualistic scriptures] the Kaula doctrine is present for those who have perceived the [highest state of] resorption, as exemplified in such [texts] as the *Kālapāda* [in the statement] "He may initiate even untouchables".

The passage to which Abhinavagupta refers is this:[701]

> The [transcendent] Śāntyatītā [Kalā] is the supreme, inactive, eternal void. When [a Guru] has gained knowledge of that, Skanda, he may initiate even untouchables.

Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha argues, as one would expect, that it is purely rhetorical in intention, but he introduces into his argument a report that the Śāktas were citing it in support of their practice of actually initiating such persons. Śaiddhāntikas, he insists, must not follow their example.[702]

---

[699] See, for example, SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 282–287 for a detailed account of the orgiastic *cakrakrīḍā/vīramelāpaḥ* given in the *vīratāṇḍavavidhipaṭalaḥ* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s fourth *Ṣaṭka* and by Vimalaprabodha in his *Kālīkulakramārcana*. The participation of women of the following castes/professions, in addition to those of the four Varṇas, is prescribed in those sources: Pukkasa, liquor-seller (*dhvajinī*), Antyaja, potter (*cakriṇī*), dyer (*chippiṇī*), butcher (*saunakī*), Mātaṅga, tanner (*carmakārī*), fisherman (*dhīvarī*), prostitute (*veśyā*), washerman (*dhāvakī*), and dancer (*nartakī*). The *Mādhavakula* (*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, f. 128r7 [A]; paraphrased in *Tantrāloka* 29.66 and quoted by Jayaratha thereon [B]) lists nine such woman in this context. They are the wives of a Mātaṅga, a Ḍomba, a butcher, a confectioner (*kandukaḥ*) (*kaṃdukī* A : *kārmukī* B), a tanner, a liquor-seller, a cremation-ground worker (*kāpālikaḥ*), a fisherman, and a potter. The words *kāpālikaḥ* and *kandukaḥ* have not been registered in our dictionaries in the meanings attested here. The use of the former in the meaning 'cremation-ground worker'—see also *Narmamālā* 2.24cd, *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 7.44ab and 8.995, and *Lokaprakāśa*, p. 6, l. 3 (*kāpālakaḥ* in a list of serving castes)—survives in the Kashmiri derivative *kāwojᵘ/kāwujᵘ* (GRIERSON 1915 and 1932, p. 495b41–46). For *kandukaḥ* in the meaning 'confectioner' see Prakrit *kaṃḍua-* and *kaṃḍaviya-*. Such caste-promiscuous orgiastic rites are also attested by Kashmirian critics of Tantric practice. Kṣemendra attacks them in *Daśāvatāracarita* 10.26 as a symptom of the degeneration of society that will herald the descent of Kalkin, Viṣṇu's tenth Avatāra: *cakrasthitau rajakavāyakacarmakārakāpālikapramukhaśilpibhir ekapātre | pānena muktim avikalparatotsavena vṛttena cotsavavatā guravo vadanti* '[At that time] the Gurus teach that liberation is attained in a Cakra gathering by drinking [wine] from a single vessel with dyers of cloth, weavers, tanners, cremation-ground attendants, and other such persons of the service-castes (*śilpibhiḥ*), and through ecstatic orgies of indiscriminate love-making'; and he gives a vivid description of such a Śākta ritual in *Narmamālā* 3.1–85 (84cd: *nirvibhāgo 'bhavat teṣāṃ raticakramahotsavaḥ*). A tanner, a butcher, a potter, a fisherman, and a weaver are mentioned among the participants in 3.13–14. The Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa tells us that king Kalaśa (r. 1063–1089) fell under the corrupting influence of various Tantric teachers, one of whom he describes as a merchant who had become a Guru of dyers and other workers (*Rājataraṅgiṇī* 7.283: *rajakādīnāṃ śilpināṃ gurutām agāt*) and was giving initiation to Bhairava-worshiping Śākta brahmins (*bhaṭṭapādāḥ*) (7.283). Evidently the term *śilpī* used in this context by Kṣemendra has a wider sense than that of 'artisan' given in the dictionaries. It denotes rather a person of any service-caste, who lives by providing a service to the pure castes, from weaving to disposing of the dead.

[700] *Mālinīvijayavārtika* 1.196c–197b: *ata evāsti saṃhāradṛśāṃ kauliky apīha dṛk || yathoktaṃ kālapādādau dīkṣayec chvapacān iti.*

[701] *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* 8.7: *śāntyatītā bhaved vyoma tat paraṃ śāntam avyayam | taṃ viditvā mahāsena śvapacān api dīkṣayet*. In the other recensions of this scripture the same expression appears in the *Trayodaśaśatika-Kālottara* (f. 23r5, *Dīkṣāpaṭala* v.6: *śāntyatītaṃ paraṃ vyoma sarvagaṃ pāśamocakam | taṃ viditvā mahāsena śvapacān api dīkṣayet*). But 'plants' take the place of 'untouchables' in the versions of the *Dviśatika-Kālottara* (f. 2v7, 5.5) (D) and *Saptaśatika-Kālottara* (f. 5v1–2, 8.7c–8b) (S): **śāntyatītaṃ* (D:*śāntātītaṃ* S) *paraṃ vyoma tat paraṃ* **śāntam* (D:*param* S) *avyayam | taṃ viditvā mahāsena* **sthāvarāṇy api* (D:*sthāvarāṇy anu* S) *dīkṣayet*.

[702] *Sārdhatriśatikālottaravṛtti*, p.65, ll.6–10: *śvapacān api dīkṣayed ity atiśayārtho 'piśabdopahitasya bhāvārthasya "api parvataṃ śirasā bhindyād" ityādāv iva* **parātiśayapratipādanārthatvena* (em. : *pare 'tiśayapratipādanārthatvena* Ed.) *vidhiviṣayatvāsaṃbha***vād iti śirasā parvatabhedavan mlecchaśvapacādidīkṣaṇam atrāpi* **mantavyam* (conj.:*kartavyam* Ed.) *eveti yuktaṃ vyākhyātum. na tu*

Examples of the initiation of untouchables, indeed of anyone other than brahmins and kings, are naturally hard to find. Nonetheless they are not entirely absent. Thus the _Picumata_, when giving an account of its own redactional history in its opening chapter, lists fourteen disciples of a certain Padmabhairava of Orissa, stating their castes, in most cases their places of birth, and, for those who were brahmins, also their Veda and, in the case of Yajurvedins, their Śākhā. They include two untouchables.[703] The account lacks the artificiality that might suggest that it is a pure fabrication, and even if it were fabricated it would nonetheless reveal that this tradition wished to signal to its followers that the initiation of untouchables has a venerable precedent. Similar evidence is to be found in the literature of the Śākta cult of the goddess Kubjikā in its accounts of the nine and sixteen Nāthas that initiates include in their worship. Among these too there are untouchables.[704]

Nor is it the case that all Gurus of the Siddhānta would have agreed with Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha that the statement in the _Kālottara_ is merely rhetorical. This may be inferred from the passage of the _Guhyasiddhi_ of Padmavajra cited above.[705] For that tells the Buddhist adept to acquire a girl for his observance from a family of untouchables as payment for his giving them Saiddhāntika Maṇḍala initiation, which reveals not only that an intimate knowledge of the rituals of the Siddhānta could be taken for granted among these Tantric Buddhists, but also that to give Śaiva initiation to such people was not out of the question.

---

kulācāryair iva balāt kartavyam iti ‘The words _śvapacān api dīkṣayet_ convey the superiority [of such Gurus rhetorically]. For there is no possibility of [this optative's] being injunctive, because [Pāṇini's rule _Aṣṭādhyāyī_ 3.3.154 teaches us that] when a verb [in the optative] is qualified by _api_ [before it] the intention is [only] to express the superior capacity [of the agent], as in [the standard example of the grammarians] _api parvataṃ śirasā bhindyāt_ "He will be able, I fancy, to break a mountain with his head". So it is right to explain that in this case likewise [the reference to] the initiating of foreigners, untouchables, and the like *is to be understood (conj.) in the manner the breaking of a mountain with the head [in that example] and should not be forced to mean, as it is by the Kaula Gurus, that these persons should actually be initiated’. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha is basing his analysis of _api dīkṣayet_ on _Aṣṭādhyāyī_ 3.3.154 (_saṃbhāvane 'lam iti cet siddhāprayoge_). The example _api parvataṃ śirasā bhindyāt_ is given in the _Kāśikāvṛtti_ thereon. The crucial point in this rule for Rāmakaṇṭha is that an optative can be used to express the supposition that someone has the ability to do something, provided that the action envisaged does not actually take place (_siddhāprayoge_). His interpretation is forced, because _api_ is more naturally taken with the noun that precedes it than with the verb that follows.

[703] The fourteen comprise eight brahmins: four Atharvavedins, of whom three are from Madhyadeśa and one from Sindhu, a Sāmavedin from Kashmir, a Vājasaneyin Yajurvedin from Lampā, a Ṛgvedin of Kāśī, and an Āpastamba-Taittirīya Yajurvedin from Oḍḍiyāna. The remaining six are two Kṣatriya princes from Sindhu, two Śūdras of Saurāṣṭra, and the two untouchables (Mātaṅgas), whose place of birth is not recorded. See _Picumata_ f. 2v4–6, 3r4–5 (1.1.54–62, 76–81): _oḍradeśe tu jātasya devadattasya saṃjñayā | caraṇā *bahvṛcasyātha_ (em.: _bahvṛjasyātha_ Cod.) _ādeśena na saṃśayaḥ_ || 55 _asiddhas tv eva deveśi padmabhairavasaṃjña*kaḥ_ (corr.: _kāḥ_ Cod.) | _caturviṃśatisāhasraṃ granthaṃ dvādaśabhiḥ punaḥ_ || 56 _saṃghāraṃ tu sahasrais tu kariṣyati śivecchayā | anenaiva tu *tantreṇa_ (conj.: _mantreṇa_ Cod.) _tataḥ siddhiṃ prayāsya*ti_ (conj.: _si_ Cod.) || 57 _etat tantram asiddhasya sakāśāt *tata_ (conj.: _tava_ Cod.) _eva hi | śruṇviṣyanti mahābhāge śiṣyāś caiva caturdaśa_ (corr.: _caturdaśaṃ_ Cod.) || 58 _raktabhairavako nāmnā jvālābhairavako 'paraḥ | helābhairavakaś caiva trayo 'py ete mahāyaśe_ || 59 _madhyadeśasamutpannā *caraṇātharvaṇās_ (conj. [Aiśa = _caraṇād atharvaṇās_; cf. 1.52c and 1.62c]: _caraṇaṃtharvvaṇaṃ_ Cod.) _tathā | vāmabhairavako devi vijayabhairavako 'paraḥ_ || 60 _saurāṣṭrāyāṃ *samutpannau śūdrau jātyā prakīrtitau_ (conj.: _samutpanna śūdrā jātyā prakīrtitaḥ_ Cod.) | _bībhatsabhairavo devi gajakarṇas tu bhairavaḥ_ || 1.61 _caṇḍabhairava*kaś_ (corr.: _kāś_ Cod.) _caiva sindhuviṣayasaṃbha*vāḥ_ (corr.: _vaḥ_ Cod.) | _bībhatsabhairavo devi gajakarṇabhairavo 'pi ca_ || 1.62 _kṣatri*yau_ (corr.: _yo_ Cod.) _rājaputrau tu caṇḍabhairava*kaḥ_ (corr.: _kā_ Cod.) _punaḥ | brāhmaṇo 'tharvaṇo devi caraṇena na saṃśayaḥ_ || ... 76 _karālabhairavo nāma tathā ucchuṣmabhairavaḥ | mātaṅgajātisaṃbhū*tau_ (corr.: _to_ Cod.) _padmabhairavaśiṣya*kau_ (corr.: _gau_ Cod.) || 77 _yamabhairava*kaś cānyaḥ_ (corr.: _kāś cānyāḥ_ Cod.) _kāśmīre saṃbhaviṣyati | chandogo brāhmaṇo devi tathā anyo bhaviṣyati_ || 78 _viṣṇubhairavanāmāno lampāyāṃ viṣaye tathā | vājimadhyaṃdine vipro bhaviṣyati tathāparaḥ_ || 79 _dakṣiṇabhairavaḥ kāśyām utpanno brāhmaṇas tathā | *bahvṛco cāparaḥ śiṣyo bhaviṣyati_ (conj.: _bahvayo cāparā śiṣyā bhaviṣyanti_ Cod.) _na saṃśayaḥ_ || 80 _oḍḍiyāne mahādevi tathā śekharabhairavaḥ | brāhmaṇo taittirīyaka āpastambo bhaviṣyati_ || 81 _caturdaśa samākhyātā padmabhairavaśiṣyakāḥ | jñātvā dvādaśasāhasraṃ siddhiṃ prāpsyanti suvrate._

[704] The names, castes, and birthplaces of these twenty-five Gurus are given in the _Nityāhnikatilaka_, ff. 17v5–24r2. Only twelve are brahmins. The other thirteen are five Kṣatriyas, three Vaiśyas, four Śūdras, and one untouchable, a maker and seller of alcoholic liquor (_kalyapālaḥ_) from Kundāpura in Oḍḍadeśa. He is venerated as the ninth in the series of the nine Nāthas. See ff. 19v4–20r1: _oḍḍaviṣaye kundāpurapattane janma jātikalyapālo māhilo nāma | caryānāma śrīkuharākhyadevaḥ | pūjānāma śrīkṛṣṇānandanāthaḥ | śrīkīrtināma gauś chalīkṛtā tadā śrīgaucchalīśadevaḥ | khambaḥ khalitaṃ tadā śrīkhambhādityanāthaḥ | kapilaḥ prabodhitas tadā śrīkapilaprabodhānandadevaḥ | asyaiva śaktiḥ śrīkṛṣṇapiṅgalāmbā pā pū_ || _9_ ||. A variant listing of the nine and sixteen Nāthas is found in the _Ciñciṇīkaulānāṃ gurusaṃtatiḥ_. There the ninth of the nine is an untouchable (_mātaṅgaḥ_) called Kañjika from Elāpura (modern Ellora): _śrī-elāpure mahāsthāne janma mātaṃgaḥ *śrīkañjiko_ (corr.: _śrīkaṃjikā_ Cod.) _nāma caryāsuprasiddhaḥ śrīvimalagalanāthaḥ | pūjyaḥ śrīkṛṣṇānandadevaḥ | gopyaḥ śrīkhagānandadevaḥ | tenāpi kīrtiṃ kṛtvā sālavane *sālastambho 'nugṛhītaḥ_ (corr.: _sālastaṃbhānugṛhītaḥ_ Cod.) || _9_ ||. Among the sixteen the seventh is Jayadeva, a _karavālaḥ_, probably a liquor-maker (cf. Bihārī, Nepālī _kalwār_ ‘a maker and seller of liquor’ [Skt. _kalyapālaḥ_]), from Vahapura, and the twelfth is a _mātaṅgaḥ_ from Śaubhāra called Lo: _śrīvahapure karavālaḥ śrījayadevanāmasuprasiddhaḥ | *śrīprayāgadevaḥ_ (corr.: _śrīprayāśadevaḥ_ Cod.) | _pūjya *bhairavānandadevaḥ_ (conj.: _bahyaravānandadevaḥ_ Cod.) | _śrīvīrānandadevaḥ | gopya śrīmeghānandadevaḥ_ || 7 || ..._śrīśaubhāranagare janma mātaṃga lo nāma caryāsu prasiddhaḥ śrīkhaḍgānandadevaḥ | pūjya śrībālānandadevaḥ | ratnānandadevaḥ | tṛṣṭikānandadevaḥ | gopya viraktānandadevaḥ_ || _12_ ||.

[705] See here p. 144.

For if it had been, this Buddhist strategy could not have been recommended.

Our sources reveal, then, that the Śaivas extended their recuitment beyond the high-caste circles from which most of our evidence of the religion derives. But, of course, they do not readily reveal the extent to which it was adopted outside these élites. The epigraphical evidence is almost entirely restricted in this regard to records of the pious activities of rulers and brahmins, and the Śaiva sources, being largely prescriptive in their concerns, tell us much about what should or could be done by or for various categories of person but give us no sense of how widely these prescribed activities were adopted or supported. One of the tasks of future research, then, should be to gather data that will improve our ability to address this question. At present I have little to offer in this direction. But I can at least point to evidence that the fortunes of Śaivism were not as dependent on the favour of ruling dynasties as most of the data presented here might lead one to assume, enjoying at least in some regions such widespread acceptance that changes in the allegiance of a dynasty had little effect on its popularity. Research into recorded temple construction in the period 450–1050 in South and North Karnataka, that is to say, in the Tuṅgabhadrā-Kāverī and Tuṅgabhadrā-Bhīmā zones, has counted 164 Śaiva temples as against 30 Vaiṣṇava in the former and 199 Śaiva as against 32 Vaiṣṇava in the latter. This great preponderance of Śaiva foundations might be attributed solely to the predilection of the region's kings, were it not for the evidence of the next three centuries, when the region passed under the rule of the Hoysaḷas (c. 1047–c. 1345), who favoured Vaiṣṇavism over Śaivism. For we see a far smaller shift in the preponderance of Śaiva temples than the theory of dependence on royal patronage would lead us to expect. 293 Vaiṣṇava temples were established. But the total of new Śaiva foundations remains very high, at about 1,030.[706] This suggests the hypothesis that rulers who invested in Śaivism the wealth they acquired through conquest and revenue were also reflecting the deeply rooted preference of the majority of their subjects.

Similarly, in Kashmir the rule of the Vaiṣṇava Kārkoṭas (c. 626–855) was marked by the founding of many royal Viṣṇus, but it would seem that Śaivism, which predominates in the record of religious foundations in earlier times, had merely moved out of the limelight.[707] For immediately after the demise of that dynasty it burst forth into its golden age.[708] The humbler religious landscape of small-scale religious devotion tells the same story. For among the very numerous pilgrimage sites of the region those sacred to Śiva, Bhairavas, and Śaiva goddesses are overwhelmingly in the majority. We see this in an abundant local literature of Māhātmyas, texts in Sanskrit promoting these sites; and we see it in what survives in manuscript of the *Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha*, a collection of abstracts of materials gathered without sectarian bias by the local Sanskrit scholar Sāhibrām (d. 1872) with the help of a staff of Paṇḍits for an extensive descriptive survey of these sites and their traditions commissioned by Mahārāja Raṇbīr Singh (r. 1868–1885).[709] We also see it in the information on the sacred sites of Kashmir, probably compiled around the seventh century, that is found in the Kashmirian *Nīlamatapurāṇa*,[710] and in the list of the major shrines of the valley given by Kalhaṇa in the twelfth century in the preamble of his history of the country.[711]

---

[706] For all these data see SETTAR 1992, p. 43 and 54. I have added to the Śaiva totals those of the much less numerous Śākta temples.

[707] For knowledge of non-Buddhist religious foundations in Kashmir during the centuries before the advent of the Kārkoṭa dynasty we depend almost entirely on the account of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. It is highly unreliable for this period, being wildly inaccurate in its chronology, and, in the case of the Hunnic Hephthalite kings that reigned from the time of Mihirakula to the advent of the Kārkoṭas, that is to say, c. 530–626, it is evident from numismatic data that it also disordered. But it is significant nonetheless that almost all the early foundations that Kalhaṇa records other than Buddhist monasteries and brahmin settlements (Agrahāras) are Śaiva. Aśoka, evidently the emperor Aśoka of Buddhist fame, erects a stone enclosure for the national Śiva Vijayeśvara and two Aśokeśvaras within that enclosure (1.105–106). His son Jalauka establishes Jyeṣṭharudra in the capital (1.124), and builds a stone temple for Bhūteśvara at the Nandikṣetra (1.148). His wife Īśānadevī establishes circles of the Mothers (*mātṛcakram*) at the points of access to the valley (1.122). Rāvaṇa worships Vaṭeśvara, builds a Maṭha around it, and dedicates the country to its maintenance (1.195–196). The Hephthalite Huns, with whom his chronicle reaches kings known to us from other sources, are reported to have established Śivas, and, given that they were of Central Asian origin, this no doubt reflects the fact that Śaivism was the dominant tradition of their new subjects, though the Vaiṣṇavism that would come to the fore under the Kārkoṭas begins to overlay the Śaiva substrate during and after the interregnum of the non-Kashmirian Mātṛgupta. Mihirakula establishes a Mihireśvara in the capital (1.306). Baka establishes a Bakeśvara (1.329), Gopāditya a Jyeṣṭheśvara (1.341), and Khiṅkhila Narendrāditya shrines of Bhūteśvara (1.347). Tuñjīna I, son of Jalaukas (probably this is the Jalauka, founder of Jyeṣṭharudra, whom Kalhaṇa makes the son of Aśoka), establishes a Tuṅgeśvara (2.14) and Sandhimat founds a Sandhīśvara, an Īśeśvara with the name of his Śaiva Guru Īś[ān]a, and many other Liṅgas (2.131–134). Tuñjīna Pravarasena I builds the temple of his Śiva Pravareśvara together with a circle of the Mothers (3.97). The short-reigned non-Kashmirian Mātṛgupta establishes a Viṣṇu Mātṛguptasvāmin (3.263). Pravarasena II (probably the successor of Mihirakula, and identical with Pravarasena I), represented by Kalhaṇa as a supremely devout Śaiva, intends accordingly to install a Pravareśvara in the capital that he has founded with his name (Pravarapura), but a Viṣṇu miraculously takes its place, which the king names Jayasvāmin after the architect of the temple (3.350–351). But he installs Sadbhāvaśrī and four other [Śaiva] goddesses (3.353) in the capital. Laḥkhaṇa Narendrāditya, identified by STEIN (1900, vol. 1, p. 106) with the Laḥkhaṇa Udayāditya whose name appears on a Kashmirian silver coin, establishes Viṣṇu Narendrasvāmin (3.383). His brother Tuñjīna Raṇāditya prepares to install two Raṇeśvaras in two new temples but Viṣṇu Raṇasvāmin miraculously takes the place of one through the influence of his wife Raṇārambhā (3.439–455). The couple establish a Viṣṇu Raṇārambhasvāmin, a Śiva Raṇārambheśvara, and a Maṭha for Pāśupatas (3.460). The king establishes the Sun-God Raṇapurasvāmin (3.462), and Amṛtaprabhā, another wife of his, an Amṛteśvara (3.463). His son Vikramāditya establishes a Vikrameśvara (3.474) and his wife Bimbā a Bimbeśvara (3.482). On the later Hephthalites in Kashmir see DANI 1996.

[708] See SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 425–433.

Relevant evidence of another kind is available for Andhra and the Far South, since there, where culturally hostile invaders made fewer and less damaging inroads, there remains intact a much larger body of epigraphical evidence recording pious donations, engraved on the walls of the temples of the deities to which they were made. A survey of temple building and donation in Andhra during the thirteenth century under the Kākatīyas of Warangal has shown that the great majority of endowed deities mentioned in the epigraphical corpus were Śaiva. 247 Śiva temples constitute 67 per cent of the total and Vaiṣṇava temples only 19 per cent, and the latter are mostly south of the Krishna river, increasing in frequency the further south they are, no doubt under the influence of the resurgence of Vaiṣṇavism in the Tamil region after Rāmānuja (d. 1137). From the record of those who made donations to these Śaiva temples, particularly to long-established, major temples such as those of Drākṣārāma and Tripurāntaka, we can see that they were far from being restricted to the circles of royalty or the landed gentry. A high proportion of the donations are from herders, women, and traders.[712] Likewise in the Tamil country we find in Cola times (850–1279) a number of records of donations to Śiva temples made by members of the Sacchūdra Veḻḻāḷa caste, the dominant cultivators of the region.[713]

---

[709] On the Kashmirian Māhātmya literature and the *Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha* of Sāhibrām see STEIN 1900, vol. 2, pp. 383–385.

[710] See TOKUNAGA 1994.

[711] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* 1.29–38. Here he mentions the following as the principal deities of the region: Gaurī in the form of the river Vitastā, the Nāgas "Śaṅkha, Padma, and others", Pāpasūdana (the Śiva Kapaṭeśvara), the goddess Saṃdhyā (Saṃdhyābhaṭṭārikā), Svayambhū (a Śiva), Bheḍādevī, [the Śivas of the] Nandikṣetra (Bhūteśvara and Jyeṣṭheśvara), Śāradādevī, Cakradhara (Viṣṇu), and Vijayeśvara (Śiva).

[712] This evidence is derived from the work of TALBOT (2001, pp. 87–125), who provides detailed statistics and on their basis presents a cogent analysis of the patterns of temple patronage in this region and period.

[713] For Veḻḻāḷas who gave to Śaiva temples, most commonly cattle or cash to provide an income to fund a perpetual lamp, see, e.g., *SII* 3:17 of A.D. 1014; *SII* 3:116 of A.D. 991; *SII* 13:34 (*ARE* 312 of 1906) of A.D. 941; *SII* 13:44 (*ARE* 227 of 1911); *SII* 13:56 (*ARE* 542 of 1920); *SII* 13:62 (*ARE* 618 of 1920); *SII* 13:66 (*ARE* 238 of 1923); *SII* 13:112 (*ARE* 126 of 1914); *SII* 13:189 (*ARE* 332 of 1927); *SII* 13:300 (*ARE* 5 of 1907) of A.D. 871-907; *SII* 13:47 (*ARE* 216 of 1932-1933); *SII* 14:47 (*ARE* 216 of 1932-33); *SII* 14:131 (*ARE* 213 of 1932-33); *SII* 14:135 (*ARE* 416 of 1929-30); *SII*

There is another manner in which Śaivism is likely to have played a significant part in the process of social integration during this period, one which I wish to touch on only briefly and tentatively at this stage. This was in the incorporation of the many local deity-cults of the regions being drawn into the orbit of the state and its patronage of religion. In this it seems that it was the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the worship of Bhairavas, goddesses, and Yoginīs, with their indifference to caste-status and brahmanical criteria of purity and their cults of possession that are likely to have provided the avenue of assimilation.[714] It seems likely, though difficult to prove, that much of the character of these traditions resulted from this process of incorporation on the frontier between the brahmanical and the not yet brahmanized.

THE ŚAIVA-BRAHMANICAL ORDER

While extending its influence far beyond the confines of the orthodox brahmanical world the Śaivism of the Mantramārga sought to guard itself against dissociation from that world. It elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism,[715]

14:140 (*ARE* 76 of 1907); *SII* 14:155 (*ARE* 77 of 1907; *SII* 14:202 (*ARE* 394 of 1929-30); *SII* 14:246 (*ARE* 108 of 1908); *SII* 17:197 (*ARE* 176 of 1904) of A.D. 1018-19; *SII* 17: 204 (*ARE* 183 of 1904); *SII* 17:238 (*ARE* 216 of 1904) of A.D. 1006/7 (with a Valaṅgai Vēḷaikkārar soldier); *SII* 17:471 (*ARE* 440 of 1904) of A.D. 990/991; *SII* 2:95 (a merchant [*vyāpārin*]); *SII* 17:315 (*ARE* 286 of 1904) (a Valaṅgai Vēḷaikkārar soldier) of A.D. 1016. See also GHOSE 1996, pp. 277–282 on the predominance of the upper statra of non-brahmin society in temple patronage in recent times.

[714] On the process by which local deities, often of tribal origin, were assimilated into Śākta Śaivism through their adoption as the tutelaries of local rulers see SINHA 1962 and 1987; and MALLEBREIN and VON STIETENCRON 2008, pp. 39–67, 93–107, and 173–178. See also CHAKRABARTI 2001, especially pp. 165–233 (Chapter 5: 'Appropriation as a Historical Process: The Cult of the Goddess'), for the case of Bengal. See SINHA KAPUR 2002, pp. 209–225 on the case of Mewar in Rajasthan.

[715] See, e.g., *Svacchanda* 11.69-74 (Buddhists > Jainas > Vaidikas > Sāṃkhyas > Yogasthas > Pāśupatas > Mausulas and Kārukas > Vaimalas and Lākulas > Śaivas); *Sarvajñānottara* A f. 37r1–3, B p. 96 (*Liṅgoddhārādiprakaraṇa* v. 3): *jñānacaryānvito bauddho buddhitattvam avāpnuyāt | tāmasaṃ *jinabhaktas tu pauruṣaṃ brahmavedinaḥ || 4 kevalārthavidaḥ kālaṃ prāpnuvanti jitendriyāḥ | vaidyeśvareśvare tattve somasiddhāntavedinaḥ* (A : (A : *jinabhaktānāṃ prāpnuvanti* + + + + B); Āgama quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, p. 207: *buddhitattve sthitā bauddhā guṇeṣu tu ārhatāḥ sthitāḥ / guṇamūrdhni sthitāḥ sāṃkhyā avyakte pāñcarātrikāḥ*; Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1977, p. 553 (vv. 7–8): *buddhitattve sthitā bauddhā jainās tu guṇamastake | vedāntajñās tu tadyonau puruṣe bhagavanmukhāḥ | pāśupatās tu māyāyāṃ vidyāyāṃ tu mahāvratāḥ. bauddhādiliṅginām eṣāṃ muktisthānāny anukramāt*; Trilocanaśiva, *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, pp. 73–87; Kṣemarāja, *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* on *Sūtra* 8 (*tadbhūmikāḥ sarvadarśanasthitayaḥ* 'The positions of all doctrines are its stages'); and here p. 47 (*Manthānabhairava*).

the religion of the king manifest in his initiation, his consecration, and his royal temples, thus mirroring and validating the incorporative structure of the state's power. But though it thereby asserted, especially in its Śākta forms, the limited nature of the brahmanical observance that formed the lowest level and broad base of this hierarchy, it was careful to insist not only that the brahmanical scriptures that govern this observance are exclusively valid in their own domain but also that their injunctions are as binding on Śaivas after their initiation as they were before it if they remained in that domain as active members of society. Śaiva ascetics were allowed a degree of choice in this matter, at least in theory, but householders were not.[716] The religion of the Śaivas, then, was not Śaivism alone but rather Śaivism and Brahmanism, a fact born out not only by their literature but also by biographical data and the epigraphic record of the activities of Śaiva kings.

Moreover, the determination of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga to be fully embedded in the brahmanical tradition is manifest not only in this rule that initiates should maintain their brahmanical obligations but also in the fact that they extended their own ritual repertoire in order to bring it into greater congruence with the brahmanical. To this end they created a Śaiva ritual of cremation and a series of rituals to mirror the numerous brahmanical postmortuary rituals in which the deceased receives offerings first as a hungry ghost (*pretakriyā*) and then in Śrāddha rituals as an ancestor, after his incorporation with the immediate ascendants of his patriline (*sapiṇḍikaraṇam*). It is clear that the creators of these additions were motivated by nothing but the desire to be seen to conform to the norms of brahmanical society once the Śaivas had moved to extend recruitment beyond the inevitably restricted circle of ascetics into the more numerous ranks of married householders. For these rituals and especially the Śrāddhas make no sense in srictly Śaiva terms, since initiates are held to attain liberation as soon as they leave their bodies and therefore should require no ceremonies designed to ensure their well-being after death.[717] This accommodation of Brahmanism no doubt gave Śaivism a distinct advantage over those religions that denied outright the authority of the brahmanical scriptures and there can be little doubt that this would greatly have increased its acceptability in the eyes of kings, who could thus draw on the power of the new religion to sanctify their rule and enhance their might—the former predominantly through the Siddhānta, the latter predominantly through the Śākta Śaiva systems—while at the same time maintaining their legitimacy in their ancient role as the protectors of the brahmanical social order.

As Śaivism advanced by developing the strategies explored in this study it achieved a transregional organization and a consequent standardization of its rituals and doctrines; and this transregional uniformity, I propose, would have heightened its appeal to kings by enabling it more easily to be perceived as a transcendent means of legitimation, empowerment, and the integration of regional traditions, as an essential part of a pan-Indian socio-religious order that each kingdom sought to exemplify. It was by virtue of its great success in attracting royal patronage that it came to exert such a pervasive influence on the religions around it; and it was also on the basis of this success that it could construct the impressive edifice of a literature that is almost entirely silent about these vital but less elevated aspects of its life.

---

[716] The Śaivas' doctrines of the relationship between their scriptures and those of the brahmanical tradition with respect both to householders and ascetics are examined in detail together with epigraphical evidence in SANDERSON forthcoming *b*.

[717] For a more detailed examination of the Śaiva postmortuary rituals and their rationale see SANDERSON 1995a, pp. 31–38. They are not found in the preceding Pāśupata tradition of the Atimārga, in which the dead were buried, nor indeed in the earliest stage of the Mantramārga represented by the substantial *Niśvāsa* corpus, which in this and numerous other respects remained close to its Atimārgic antecedents, appearing only in the *Dikṣottara*, which was added to that corpus at a later date, and in several other later scriptures of the Siddhānta, most notably in the *Kiraṇa*, whose treatment of the Śrāddha rituals became the basis for that found in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu and the later Paddhatis that followed its lead. An intermediate stage in this development is probably to be recognized in the *Sarvajñānottara* and the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, which teach a cremation ritual for initiates but make no mention of Śrāddha rituals. I say that the Śrāddhas make less sense in strictly Śaiva terms, because some attempt was made to justify cremation. To create their cremation ritual the Śaivas adapted their ritual of initiation. The soul of the deceased is to be drawn back into the corpse before it is burned on the pyre in order to undergo initiation, just as it did in life. Since the function of initiation is to liberate the soul by destroying all that impedes its liberation this re-initiation of the deceased was justified as a means of eliminating any obstacles that might still be present as a result of the initiate's failure to expiate breaches of discipline that had not been expiated during his lifetime.

ABBREVIATIONS

AIISPL = *American Institute of Indian Studies Photograph Library*
ARE = *Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy*
ASB = Asiatic Society of Bengal
ASI = Archaeological Survey of India
BEFEO = *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*
Blue Annals = ROERICH 1995.
BORI = Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
CII 3 = FLEET 1888
CII 4 = MIRASHI 1955
CII 5 = MIRASHI 1963
DK = Derge Kanjur
DT = Derge Tenjur
EC = *Epigraphia Carnatica*
EFEO = École française d'Extrême-Orient
EI = *Epigraphia Indica*
EITA = MEISTER et. al. 1983–1991
GOS = Gaekwad's Oriental Series
HBI = CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA 1990
IA = *Indian Antiquary*
IASWR = Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions
IAR = *Indian Archaeology, A Review*
IFI = Institut français d'Indologie
IFP = Institut français de Pondichéry
IIJ = *Indo-Iranian Journal*
ISCC = BERGAIGNE 1893
JA = *Journal Asiatique*
K = Khmer inscription, numbered as in CŒDÈS 1966
KLK = Kaiser Library, Kathmandu
KSTS = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
LKA = VAJRĀCĀRYA 1996
NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu
NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Reel number

BLO = Bodleian Library, University of Oxford
r. = ruled
SII = *South Indian Inscriptions*
SORL = Srinagar, Oriental Research Library, Jammu & Kashmir Research and Publication Department
T. = TAKAKUSU and WATANABE 1924–1932
Tōh. = UI et al. 1934
TUL = Tokyo University Library
ULC = University Library, Cambridge
Xiyu ji = BEAL 1884

REFERENCES

SANSKRIT TEXTS AND AUTHORS

Agnipurāṇa, ed. Baladeva Upādhyāya. Kashi Sanskrit Series 174. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1966.

Anargharāghava of Murāri with the commentary of Rucipati, ed. Pandit Durgâprasâd and Wâsudev Laxman Shâstrî Pansîkar. Kāvyamālā 5. 3rd edition. Bombay: Nirnaya-sagar, 1908.

Anekārthasaṃgraha of Hemacandra, ed. Th. Zachariae. Sources of Sanskrit Lexicography 1. Vienna: Alfred Hölder; Bombay: Education Society's Press, 1893.

Abhayapaddhati, the commentary of Abhayākaragupta on the *Buddhakapālatantra*. NAK MS 5-21, NGMPP A48/2: Maithila script.

Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu, ed. P. Pradhan. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.

Abhidhānottaratantra. A = IASWR, Film-strip MBB–1971–100-108: palm-leaf; Bhujimol script; A.D. 1138; B = NGMPP E695/3: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1665. See also *mNgon brjod rgyud bla ma* under Tibetan Texts.

Abhisamayamañjarī of Śākyarakṣita, ed. in *Dhīḥ* 13 (1992), pp. 123–154.

Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka of Haribhadra, ed. Unrai Wogihara. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1932–1935.

Amarakośa: *Amarakośa with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries Amarapadavivṛti of Liṅgayasūrin and Amarapadapārijāta of Mallinātha*, ed. A.A. Ramanathan. Adyar Library Series 101. Adyar, Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1971.

Amṛteśadīkṣāvidhi of Viśveśvara. NAK MS 5-4867, NGMPP A231/17: paper; Devanāgarī; incomplete; no date.

Avadānakalpalatā of Kṣemendra, ed. P.L. Vaidya. 2 vols. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 22. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1959.

Āgamaḍambara of Jayantabhaṭṭa. See DEZSŌ 2005.

Āgamaprāmāṇya of Yāmunācārya, ed. M. Narasimhachary. GOS 160. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1976.

Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya of Mahāmaṇḍalācārya Jagaddarpaṇa: *Kriya-Samuccaya: A Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal Containing a Collection of Tantric Ritual by Jagaddarpaṇa* reproduced by Lokesh CHANDRA from the collection of Prof. RAGHUVĪRA. Śata-piṭaka 237. New Delhi: Sharada Rani, 1977.

Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati of Vedajñānaguru II. A = IFP MS Transcript 1056; B = IFP MS Transcript 282.

Ādikarmapradīpa, ed. Hisao Takahashi (Ādikarmapradīpa bonbun kōtei: Tōkyō daigaku shahon ni yoru [A Sanskrit edition of the *Ādikarmapradīpa* on the basis of the manuscript preserved in Tokyo University]). In *Indogaku Mikkyōgaku kenkyū: Miyasaka Yūshō hakase koki kinen ronbunshū* [Studies on Buddhist Tantra on the Occasion of the 70th Birthday of Dr. Yusho Miyasaka], vol. 2. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1993. Other witnesses:— T = Tokyo University MS 57 (New) / 349 (Old); P = the edition prepared by Louis de la Vallée Poussin on the basis of a manuscript in the Royal Asiatic Society, London, in *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux*, London, 1898, Pt. 2, pp. 186–204.

Indrabhūti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad* under Tibetan Texts.

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati (*Siddhāntasāra*) of Īśānaśiva, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. 4 parts. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 60, 72, 77, and 83.

Īśvarasaṃhitā, ed. Prativādi Bhayaṅkara. Śāstramuktāvalī 45. Kāñcī, 1923.

Ugracaṇḍāprakaraṇa. ASB MS 11354 ('Tantric Digest of Unknown Name'), ff. 39v9–67r7: paper: Newari script.

Upakeśagacchapaṭṭāvalī. See HOERNLE 1890.

Ūrmikaulārṇava. NAK MS 5-4207, NGMPP B115/9: paper; Newari script.

Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Kambalapāda. See *Sādhananidhi*.

Karmakāṇḍa, vol. 4 (*paṇḍitakeśavabhaṭṭajyotirvidā saṃskāraśodhanābhyāṃ sampāditaṃ sāṅgopāṅga-viṣṇubali-sāṅga-śaivakriyātmakaṃ karmakāṇḍam, caturthapustakam*), ed. Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid, Bombay, 1936; reproduced photographically by Lokesh Chandra in pp. 127–247 of volume 7 of *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir*, Śatapiṭaka Series 333, New Delhi, 1984.

Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī of Somaśambhu: *Karmakanda-kramavali By Sri Somasambhu*, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo. KSTS 73. Srinagar, 1947. See also *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* and *Somaśambhupaddhati*.

Kalādīkṣāpaddhati of Manoda, expanded (*vistāritaḥ*) by Śivasvāmin. A = BORI 157 of 1886-92 ('*Kalādīkṣāvidhi*': paper: Śāradā script; B = BORI MS 440 of 1875-76: paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī.

Kāṭhakagṛhyasūtra with extracts from the commentaries of Devapāla, Brāhmaṇabala, and Ādityadarśana, ed. Willem Caland. Śrīmaddayānanda Mahāvidyālaya Saṃskṛtagranthamālā 1. Lahore: Research Dept., D.A.V. College, 1925.

Kāmika. No editor accredited: published by C. Swaminatha Sivacarya. Madras: Dakṣiṇabhāratārcakasaṅgha, 1975.

Kāraṇḍavyūha, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha, Part 1, Sūtra 12, pp. 258–308. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 17. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1961.

Kālīkulakramasadbhāva. NAK MS 1-76, NGMPP A209/23: paper; Newari script; incomplete (1.1–7.2).

Kālīkulakramārcana of Vimalaprabodha. NAK MS 3-314, NGMPP A129/9: paper: Newari script; undated.

Kālottaratantra. NAK MS 5-4632, NGMPP B118/7: paper; Devanāgarī. The codex contains in sequence the following texts: (1) *Kālottare Jñānapañcāśikā*, ff. 1v1–4v7 (not a *Kālottara* recension; see GOODALL 2007, pp. 127–128), (2) *Kālajñāne Śatikam*, ff. 4v7–9r6; (3) *Kālottare Sārdhaśatikam*, ff. 1v1–6v9; (4) *Kālottare Dviśatikam*, ff. 1v1–9v3; (5) *Kālottare 'dhyuṣṭaśatam* (*Sārdhatriśatikam*), ff. 1v1–17v3; (6) *Kālottare Saptaśatikam*, ff. 1v1–25r3; (7) *Kālottare Trayodaśaśatikam*, ff. 1v1–46v7. This appears to be an apograph of NAK MS 1-1114, NGMPP B25/7, an undated Nepalese palm-leaf MS in the Nāgarī script, except that it has added the *Sārdhaśatika* recension from some other source (GOODALL 2007, p. 129).

Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya and Vāmana on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, ed. Paṇḍita Śobhitamiśra. Kāśī-saṃskṛta-granthamālā 37. Banaras: Jaya Krishna Das Harisdas Gupta, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1952.

Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha, materials compiled by Sāhibrām for Mahārāja Raṇbīr Singh (r. 1868–1885). BLO MS Stein d. 33 iii: paper; Śāradā script; incomplete.

Kiraṇa. NAK MS 5-893, NGMPP A40/3 (= *Kiraṇatantra*, *Kiraṇāgama*): palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; A.D. 924. For chapters 1–6 with the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha; see GOODALL 1998.

Kubjikāmata. See GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988.

Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha: bhinnabhinna-vidvatkartṛka paramārhatabi-

rudālaṅkṛtagūrjaracaulukyacakravarti-nṛpatikumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha / Kumārapāla Charitrasaṃgraha (A Collection of Works of Various Authors Relating to Life of King Kumarapala of Gujarat), ed. Acharya Jina Vijaya Muni. Singhi Jain Series 41. Bombay: Singhi Jain Shastra Shikshapath, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1956.

Kumārapāladevacarita of Somatilakasūri. *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*, pp. 9–33.

Kumārapāladevaprabandha of the *Caturaśītiprabandha*. *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*, pp. 112i–112xxiv.

Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha, anonymous. *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*, pp. 35–111.

Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa, Cantos I–8, with the commentary (*-saṃjīvanī*) of Mallinātha, ed. M.R. Kale, Bombay: Gopal Narayen, 1923.

Kularatnoddyota: *Kularatnoddyotatantra*. NAK MS 1-16, NGMPP A206/10: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1734.

Kulasāra. NAK 4-137, NGMPP A40/11: palm-leaf; early Nāgarī.

Kṛtyakalpataru: *Kṛtyakalpataru of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara. Vol. III, Niyatakālakāṇḍa*, ed K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1950.

Kṛṣṇayamāritantra, with the commentary (*ratnāvalī nāma pañjikā*) of Kumāracandra, ed. S. Rinpoche and V. Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text Series 9. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992.

Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī of Somaśambhu. ULC MS Add 1406 12: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated (12th century); KLK MS 539, NGMPP C114/22 ('*Kriyākāṇḍapadakramāvalī*'): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1159. See *Somaśambhupaddhati* and *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī*.

'*Kriyākramadyotikā*'. IFP MS Transcript 1076. A Śaiva miscellany.

Kriyākramadyotikāvyākhyā of Kacchapeśvaraśiva. IFP MS Transcript 109.

Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā of Kuladatta. See TANEMURA 2004b.

Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati of Vāladhārin. KLK MS 63; NGMPP C5/3: palm-leaf; Bhujimol script; A.D. 1091/2.

Gaṇaratnamahodadhi of Vardhamāna with his own commentary (*-vṛtti*), ed. J. Eggeling. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1963. First published 1879.

Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles: *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka, Indo-Asian literatures, v. 10, parts. 1–10. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1959-.

Gilgit Manuscripts, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt with the assistance of D.M. Bhattacharya and Shiv Nath Sharma. 4 volumes (volume 3 in 3 parts). Srinagar:

His Highness' Government, Jammu and Kashmir, 1939–1959.

Gītābhāṣya of Śaṅkara with the sub-commentary of Ānandagiri, ed. Kāśīnātha Śāstrī Āgāśe. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 34. Pune: Ānandāśrama Press, 1931.

Gurupañcāśikā of Āryadeva, vv. 1–33, ed. Sylvain Lévi (1929, pp. 259–263); vv. 34–50 reconstructed from the Tibetan translation by J. Pandey in *Dhīḥ* 13 (1992), pp. 16–20.

Gurupustikā of Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha. Banaras Hindu University, Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library, MS CN. 4115: paper: Śāradā script; complete but for the end of the last section.

Guhyasamayasādhanamālā. BLO MS Sansk. c.16: palm-leaf; Newari script; 13th century (?).

Guhyasamāja. See MATSUNAGA 1978.

**Guhyasamājapañjikā* of Ānandagarbha. See *gSang ba 'dus pa'i dka' grel* under Tibetan Texts.

Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi of Dīpaṅkarabhadra. Niedersaächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, Cod. MS. Sanscr. 257: palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script; incomplete, lacking the final folio. This codex, which contains several works of which this is the last, was formerly in the Phyag dpe lha khang chen mo of the Sa skya monastery, where it was photographed by Rāhul Sāṅkṛtyāyana (ISAACSON 2002, pp. 152–153).

Guhyasiddhi. In *Guhyādi-aṣṭasiddhisaṅgraha*, pp. 1–63 (Sanskrit); pp. 1–107 (Tibetan).

Guhyādi-aṣṭasiddhisaṅgraha / gSang pa grub pa logs pa'i grub pa sde brgyad bzhugs, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 1. Two parts: Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1987.

Gūḍhapadā of Advayavajra. A commentary on the *Nāmasaṃgīti*. Royal Asiatic Society, London, Hodgson MS 34: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.

Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī. NAK MS 1-1583, NGMPP B18/23: palm-leaf; Newari script. See VAJRĀCĀRYA and MALLA 1985.

Cakrasaṃvaraṭīkā of Devagupta. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Indrabhūti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad* under Tibetan Texts.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Kambalapāda. See *Sādhananidhi*.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Jayabhadra. SUGIKI 2001.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Durjayacandra. See *Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka' 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Bhavabhaṭṭa. IASWR Film-strip MBB–1–33: palm-leaf; Newari script (Bhujimol).

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Bhavabhaṭṭa, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 26. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2002.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Bhavyakīrti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i dka' 'grel dpa' bo'i yid du 'ong bzhes bya ba* under Tibetan Texts.

Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā of Vīravajra. See *Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti of Śāśvatavajra. See *De kho na nyid mkhas pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra: *The Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, Chapters I-VIII. A Critical Edition and English translation* by Christopher S. George. American Oriental Series 56. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1974.

Caturyoginīsampuṭa. An unpublished transcript prepared by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson from incomplete photographs of a palm-leaf manuscript taken by Giuseppe Tucci in Tibet, preserved in Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, Rome, in a folder marked Mahakalparaj 42.

Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri, ed. Paṇḍita Bharatacandra Śiromaṇi, Yogeśvara Bhaṭṭācārya, Kāmākhyānātha Tarkaratna, Yajñeśvara Smṛtiratna, and Pramathanātha Tarkabhūṣaṇa. 6 volumes. Bibliotheca Indica 72. Calcutta: ASB, 1873–1911.

Catuṣpīṭhatantra. NAK MS 1-1078, NGMPP B26/23 (*'Prakaraṇatantra'*): palm-leaf; Newari script; perhaps 11th century.

Catuṣpīṭhanibandha of Bhavabhaṭṭa. KLK MS 134, NGMPP C14/11: palm-leaf; Gomol script; perhaps 13th century.

Catuṣpīṭhamaṇḍalopāyikā of Caryāvratipāda. NAK MS 5-89/1, NGMPP A1298/6 and (duplicate) B30/35: palm-leaf; Bhujimol script; second half of the 11th century.

Caryāmelāpakapradīpa of Āryadeva, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Text Series 22. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2000.

Ciñciṇīkaulānāṃ gurusaṃtatiḥ. NAK MS 4-304 (*'Tvaritāvidhānasūtra'*), NGMPP A59/13: palm-leaf; Devanāgarī; incomplete. Folios 1–5, 7–12, and 14 are at the beginning of the film and ff. 15–23 are at its end, with the *Tvaritāvidhānasūtra* in the middle. Transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya. NAK MS 1-767, NGMPP B157/19: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1754.

Chummāsaṃketaprakāśa of Niṣkriyānandanātha, redacted by Anantaśakti. A = Sayaji Gaekwad Central Library, Banaras Hindu University, MS CN. 491, Acc. 328180: paper; Śāradā script; lacking the beginning; B = Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz Hs or 11387 (*'Triṃśaccarcārahasya'*): paper; Śāradā script; lacking the beginning and end.

Jayadrathayāmala, *Ṣaṭka* 1. NAK MS 5-4650, NGMPP B122/7: paper; Devanāgarī.

Jayadrathayāmala, *Ṣaṭka* 2. NAK MS 5-4650, NGMPP A153/3: paper; Devanāgarī.

Jayadrathayāmala, *Ṣaṭka* 3. A = NAK MS 5–722, NGMPPB 26/9; palm-leaf; 'Pāla-Sena' Devanāgarī; probably 12th century; B =Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Hs or 8535; paper; Newari script; A.D. 1667; C = Kaiser Library 728, NGMPP C72/1; paper; Newari script; A.D. 1671; D = NAK MS 5–1975, NGMPP A152/9; paper; Newari script; A.D. 1687; E = NAK MS 1–375, NGMPP B121/13; paper; Newari script.

Jayadrathayāmala, *Ṣaṭka* 4. NAK MS 1-1468, NGMPP B122/4: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1626/7.

Jayabhadra. See *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*.

Jayākhyasaṃhitā. NAK MS 1-49 (*'Jayākṣarasaṃhitā'*), NGMPP B29/3: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; A.D. 1395.

Jayākhyasaṃhitā, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. GOS 54. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931.

Jayottara. NAK MS 4/82, NGMPP A1306/24: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1383. Draft edition prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

Jñānaratnāvalī of Jñānaśivācārya. IFP MS Transcript 231.

Jñānalakṣmī of Sādhaka Candradatta, disciple of Ekāyanācārya Nārāyaṇagarbha. NAK MS 1-1633 (*'Jayākṣarasaṃhitā'*), NGMPP A44/7: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; A.D. 1187.

Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhūti. In *Guhyādi-aṣṭasiddhisaṅgraha*, pp. 89–157 (Sanskrit).

Jñānasiddhyāgama. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 395–481.

Jñānodayatantra, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajavallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text Series 3. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1988.

Ḍākārṇava: *Ḍākārṇavamahāyoginītantra*. NAK MS 3-293, NGMPP A138/9: paper; Newari script; perhaps 13th century; some folios in a later hand; Tibetan annotations in cursive (*dbu med*) script in the upper and/or lower margins of several folios.

Tattvaratnāvalī of Advayavajra, ed. H. Ui in Ui 1963, pp. 1–52.

Tattvaratnāvaloka of Vāgīśvarakīrti with his own commentary *-vivaraṇa*, ed. Janardan Pandey. Sarnath: Central Institute of High Tibetan Studies, 1997.

Tattvasiddhi of Śāntarakṣita. A = Baroda Oriental Institute, MS 56, ff. 91v4–108r4: paper: Nepalese Devanāgarī; B = NAK MS 5-45, NGMPP A134/2 (‘*Guhyasiddhyādināgārjunapādādi*’), ff. 37v10–44v8: paper: Nepalese Devanāgarī. See *De kho na nyid grub pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Tantrasadbhāva. NAK MS 5-445, NGMPP A44/2: palm-leaf; Kuṭila script.

Tantrasārasaṃgraha (also known as the *Nārāyaṇīya*): *Tantrasārasaṅgraha by Nārāyaṇa with Mantravimarśinī Commentary by Svarṇagrāṃa Vāsudeva*, ed. N.V.P. Unni. 2 vols. Calicut University Sanskrit Series 15–16. Calicut: Univerisity of Calicut, 2002.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (*-viveka*) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41,47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918–38.

Tarkabhāṣā of Mokṣākaragupta, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. GOS 94. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1942.

Tārābhaktisudhārṇava of Nṛsiṃha Ṭhakkura, ed. Pañcānana Bhaṭṭācārya. Tantrik Texts 21. Calcutta: Sanskrit Book Depot, 1983.

Toḍalatantra, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. *Tantrasaṃgraha*, Part 2, pp. 53–94. Yogatantra-granthamala 4. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1970.

Trayodaśaśatika-Kālottara. See *Kālottaratantra*.

Daśāvatāracarita of Kṣemendra, ed. Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyamālā 26. Bombay: Nirnaya-sāgara Press, 1891.

Dānasāgara of Ballālasena, ed. Bhabatosh Bhattacharya. Bibliotheca Indica 274 (fasc. 1-4). Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1953–1956.

Dīkṣādarśa of Vedajñānaguru II. IFP MS Transcripts 76 (A) and 153 (B).

Dīkṣāvidhi. NGMPP E 1203/3: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1829.

Dīptāgama. IFP MS Transcript 15.

Durgāpūjātattva of Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya, ed. Satīśa Candra Siddhāntabhūṣaṇa, Calcutta: Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Pariṣad, 1922.

Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī of Vidyāpati, ed. Īśāna Candra Śarman Calcutta: Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Pariṣad, 1932.

Durjayacandra. See *Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka' 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.

Devagupta. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.

Devāmṛtapañcarātra. NAK MS 1/1078, NGMPP B 29/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; probably 12th century. Transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

**Devītantrasadbhāvasāra*, a text on the cult of the Śaiva *vāmasrotaḥ* by an unnamed author. *Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles*, 3221–3222 and 3340–3341: birch-bark; proto-Śāradā script; incomplete (the first two folios only); undated; probably mid-6th century.

Devīdvyardhaśatikā. NAK MS 1-242, NGMPP A161/12 Paper; Newari script; undated.

Devīpurāṇa, ed. Panchanan Tarkaratna and Srijib Nyayaratna. Calcutta: Navabharati, 1977.

Devyāmata. NAK MS 1-279, NGMPP A41/15 (‘*Niśvāsamahātantrāntargatapratiṣṭhātantra*’): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1060.

Dviśatika-Kālottara. See *Kālottaratantra*.

**Nayatrayapradīpa*. See *Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma* under Tibetan Texts.

Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa, the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* of Sadyojyotis, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 45. Srinagar, 1926.

Narmamālā of Kṣemendra: *The Deśopadeśa & Narmamālā of Kshemendra*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 40. Srinagar, 1927. Also BALDISSERA 2005.

Navarātrapūjāvidhi A. NGMPP E 88/11: paper; Newari script; 152 folios; Sanskrit and Newari.

Navarātrapūjāvidhi B. NGMPP E 2363/29: paper, thyāsaphu; Newari script; 81 folios; Sanskrit and Newari.

Navasāhasāṅkacarita of Padmagupta *alias* Parimala, ed. Paṇḍit Vāmana Śhāstrī Islāmpurkār. Bombay Sanskrit Series 53. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot, 1995.

Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī, the commentary on the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* by Ācārya Vilāsavajra, also called Viśvarūpa, of Ratnadvīpa, maternal nephew of Agrabodhi. A = ULC MS Add. 1708: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1457 (?); B = NGMPP E360/16: paper; Newari and Devanāgarī scripts. For a critical edition of chapters 1–5 see TRIBE 1994.

Nityākaula. NAK MS 2-226, NGMPP B 26/21: palm-leaf; badly damaged and incomplete (ff. 2–3 and 6–13), breaking off in the sixth Paṭala.

Nityādisaṃgraha compiled by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. BORI MS 76 of 1875–76: paper; Śāradā (‘*Bhṛṅgeśasaṃhitā*’); exemplar of BLO MS Stein Or. d. 43 (‘*Nityādisaṃgrahābhidhānapaddhati*’).

Nityāhnikatilaka of Śrīkaṇṭhasūnu. NAK MS 3-384, NGMPP B 41/11: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1153.

Niśisaṃcāra. NAK MS 1-1606, NGMPP B 26/25: palm-leaf; Nepalese Kuṭila script; probably before 1100.

Niruktabhāṣya of Yāska with the *Niruktavivṛti* of Mukunda Śarmā: *The Niruk-*

tam of Yāska Muni [in the form of the Nighaṇṭu Bhāṣya of Kaśyapa Prajāpati] with the Niruktavivṛti and Exhaustive Notes, ed. Mukund Lha Bakshi. Panini Vaidika Granthamala 12. New Delhi: Panini, 1982.

Niśvāsakārikā. IFP MS Transcript 17.

Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā. NAK MS 1-277: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated; probably second half of the ninth century.

Niṣpannayogāvalī of Abhayākaragupta, ed. B. Bhattacharya. GOS 109. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1949 (A); *The Niṣpannayogāvalī by Abhayākaragupta. A New Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text (Revised Edition)*, ed. Yong-hyun Lee. Seoul: Baegun Press, 2004 (B).

Netratantra with the commentary (*Netroddyota*) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 46, 59. Bombay, 1926 and 1939.

Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna of Brahmaśambhu. Calcutta, ASB, MS G 4767: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; undated but probably eleventh century.

Pañcakramaṭippaṇī (*Yogimanoharā*) of Muniśrībhadra, ed. Zhongxin Jiang and Toru Tomabechi. Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft/Société Suisse-Asie Monographie Band/Volume 23. Bern: Peter Lang, 1996.

Pañcasāyakamañjarī of Jyotirīśvara, ed. Ḍhuṇḍirāja Śāstrī in *Kāmakuñjalatā (A Collection of Old and Rare Works on Kāma Śāstra)*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1967.

Pampāmāhātmyā, ed. as appendix 4 of FILLIOZAT 2001.

Pāñcarātrarakṣā of Vedāntadeśika, ed. M. Duraisvami Aiyangar and T. Venugopalacharya. Adyar, Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1996. 3rd edition. First published in 1942

Pādmasaṃhitā: *Padma Samhita*, Vol. 1, ed. Seetha Padmanabhan and R. N. Sampath. Vol. II, ed. Seetha Padmanabhan and V. Varadachari. Pāñcarātra Pariśodhana Pariṣad Series 3 and 4. Madras: Pāñcarātra Pariśodhana Pariṣad, 1974 and 1982.

Pārameśvara (= *Pauṣkarapārameśvara*). ULC MS Add. 1049 ('*Pārameśvaratantra*'): palm-leaf; Licchavi script; A.D. 819.

Pāraskaragṛhyasūtra, ed. Brahmānanda Tripāṭhī. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 209. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1991.

Piṅgalāmata (*Jayadrathādhikāra*). NAK MS 3-376, NGMPP A42/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1174.

Picumata (*Brahmayāmala*). NAK MS 3-370, NGMPP A42/6: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1052.

Puraścaryārṇava of King Pratāpasiṃhadeva Shāh of Nepal (r. 1775–1777), ed. Muralidhar Jha. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 10. Delhi: Chowkhamba. 1980.

Pauṣkarabhāṣya: The *Jñānapāda* of the *Pauṣkarāgama* with the commentary (*-bhāṣya*) of Umāpatiśivācārya, ed. Ambalavanāvalajñānasambandhaparāśaktisvāmi. Cidambaram, 1925.

Pauṣkarasaṃhitā. ed. Sri Yathiraja Sampath Kumara Ramanuja Muni. Madras: A. Srinivasa Aiyangar and M.C. Thirumalachariar, 1924.

Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya of Kṣemarāja, ed. Jagadisha Chandra Chatterji. KSTS 3. Srinagar, 1911.

Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅgācārya, ed. Rāmacandra Śāstrī, Bombay: Śāntisāgarasūri, 1888.

Prabhāvakacarita of Candraprabhasūri, ed. Hīrānanda M. Sharmā. Bombay: Tukārām Jāvajī, 1909.

Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti: *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā commentaire de Candrakīrti*, ed. Louis de la Vallée Poussin. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. St.-Petersburg: Académie imperiale des sciences, 1913.

Prākṛtaprakāśa of Vararuci with the commentary (*-manoramā*) of Bhāmaha, ed. E.B. Cowell. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1962. 3rd edition. First published in 1853.

Prāyaścittasamuccaya of Hṛdayaśiva. ULC MS Add. 2833: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1157/8.

Prāyaścittasamuccaya of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 284, pp. 127–174.

Phetkāriṇītantra, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja, In *Tantrasaṅgraha*, Part 2, pp. 161–306. Yogatantragranthamālā 4. Varanasi: Vārāṇaseyasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālaya, 1970.

Buddhakapālatantra. ULC MS Or. 158: palm-leaf; Kuṭila script; fragmentary; A.D. 1162. In the upper left corner of 1r: *oṃ vajrāmṛtatantra* ‖ *vajrāralitantra* ‖ *buddhakapālatantra*. Contains parts of the *Buddhakapālatantra* and *Vajrāmṛtatantra*.

Bṛhatkālottara. A = NAK MS 1-89, NGMPP B24/59: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated; B = NAK MS 4-131, NGMPP A43/1: palm-leaf; Pāla script; A.D. 1169.

Bṛhatsaṃhitā of Varāhamihira, ed. Ed. Avadhavihārī Tripāṭhī. 2 Parts. Sarasvatī Bhavan Granthamālā 97. Varanasi, 1968.

Bṛhannīlatantra, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul. Varajivan Prachya Bharati Granthamala 77. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 1995.

Bṛhaspatismṛti (reconstructed), ed. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. GOS 35. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.

Brahmayāmala IFP. IFP MS Transcript 522 ('*Brahmayāmalākhyaṃ mātṛpratiṣṭhātantram*'). Incomplete: contains Paṭalas 1–51.1–29b.

Brahmayāmala Triv. Trivandrum University Library, MS 1982 ('*Brahma-*

yāmalapratiṣṭhātantram'): Devanāgarī transcript; incomplete, contains Adhyāyas 1–5.71b.

**Bhagavatyāmnāyānusāriṇī*. See *bCom ldan 'das ma'i man ngag gi rjes su 'brung ba zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Bhavabhaṭṭa. See *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*.

Bhavyakīrti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i dka' 'grel dpa' bo'i yid du 'ong bzhes bya ba* under Tibetan Texts.

Bhṛṅgīśasaṃhitā, ed. Anantarāma Śāstrī. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1986.

Bhaiṣajyavastu of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, part 1.

Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa: *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 18. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1964. Essentially a reprint of the *editio princeps* of T. Ganapati Śāstrī, 1920, 1922, 1925 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 70, 76 and 84).

Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti. See DAVIDSON 1981.

Maṇḍalopāyikā of Padmaśrīmitra. TUL MS 280 (New), 499 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.

Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Vidyāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. PIFI 56. Pondicherry: IFI, 1977; *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt. PIFI 65. Pondicherry: IFI, 1982.

Matasāra. NAK MS 3-379, NGMPP B28/16 ('*Śrīvidyāpīṭhamatasāra*'): palm-leaf; Pāla script; no date

Manusmṛti with the commentary (*Manubhāṣya*) of Medhātithi, ed. Gaṅgānātha Jhā. Bibliotheca Indica 256. 3 Vols. Allahabad: ASB, 1932–1939.

Manusmṛti with the commentary (*Manvarthamuktāvalī*) of Kullūkabhaṭṭa, ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Manthānabhairava, *Kumārīkhaṇḍa*. NAK MS 5-4630, NGMPP A171/11: paper: Newari script.

Manthānabhuirava, *Siddhakhaṇḍa*. Scans courtesy of Sam Fogg Rare Books & Manuscripts, London: palm-leaf; Pāla script; probably penned in the 12th century.

Mayasaṃgraha. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP A31/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete.

Mahānayaprakāśa of Śitikaṇṭha (Old Kashmiri) with a Sanskrit commentary, ed. Mukunda Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 21. Bombay, 1918.

Mahābhārata. For the first time critically edited by V. S. Sukthankar, with the cooperation of S. K. Belvalkar, A. B. Gajendragadkar, V. Kane, R. D. Karmarkar, P. L. Vaidya, S. Winternitz, R. Zimmerman, and other scholars and illustrated by Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi. (Since 1943 ed. S. Belvalkar). 19 volumes. Poona: BORI, 1927–1959.

Mahāmaṇivipulavimānasupratiṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalpadhāraṇī. *Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles*, 1724–1733: birch-bark; proto-Śāradā; incomplete (ff. 53–57 only); undated; probably mid-6th century. Transcription: MATSUMURA Hisashi, *Mikkyō Zuzō* [Journal of Buddhist Iconography] 2, 1984, pp. 71–78. See also *Nor bu chen po rgyas pa'i gzhal med med khang shin tu rab tu gnas pa gsang ba'i dam pa'i gsang ba'i cho ga zhib mo'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i gzungs* under Tibetan Texts.

Mahāmāyāṭīkā: *Mahāmāyātantra* with the commentary (*-ṭīkā*) *Guṇavatī* of Ratnākaraśānti, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vajravallabh Dwivedi. Rare Budhist Text Series 10. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992.

Mahāmudrātilaka. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Hs or 8711 (uncatalogued): paper; Newari script; A.D. 1823/4.

Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhitantra. See *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud* under Tibetan Texts.

Mādhavakula. = *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, ff. 117v5–135v2.

Mālinīvijayavārtika. HANNEDER 1998.

Mālinīvijayottara, ed. Madhusūdana Kaula Śāstrī. KSTS 37. Srinagar, 1922.

Muktāvalī of Ratnākaraśānti, a commentary (*pañjikā*) on the *Hevajra*, ed. Ram Shankar Tripathi and Thakur Sain Negi. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series 48. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies. Cod.: NAK MS 5-98, NGMPP A135/12: paper; Devanāgarī.

Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, 3 parts.

Mṛgendra: *Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 23. Pondicherry: IFI, 1962.

Mṛgendrapaddhativyākhyā of Vaktraśambhu. IFP MS Transcript 1021.

Mṛtasugatiniyojana of Śūnyasamādhivajra, pupil of Bhadrapāda. TUL MS 307 (New), 306 (Old), ff. 1v1–9r: palm-leaf; Newari script; dated in A.D. 1269. For the Tibetan translation see *Tha ma'i mchod pa'i cho ga* under Tibetan Texts.

Mokṣakārikā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. In *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī. Yogatantragranthamālā 12. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988.

Meghadūta of Kālidāsa, ed. M.R. Kale. 7th edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969.

Mohacūḍottara. NAK MS 5-1977, NGMPP A182/2: paper; Devanāgarī script;

copied from a palm-leaf manuscript of [Valabhī era, year] 806 (= A.D. 1125/6).

Yājñavalkyasmṛti with the commentary (*-nibandha*) of the Śilāhāra king Aparāditya of Koṅkaṇa, ed. Hari Nārāyaṇa Āpṭe. Ānandaśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ 46. Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1903.

Yājñavalkyasmṛti with the commentary (*Mitākṣarā*) of Vijñāneśvara, ed. Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇśīkar. Bombay: Pāṇḍurang Jāwajī, 1926.

**Yoganiruttaratantrārthāvatārasaṃgraha* of Śraddhākaravarman. See *rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Yogaratnamālā. Kāṇha's commentary on the *Hevajra*. SNELLGROVE 1959.

Yoginījāla. NAK MS 3-667, NGMPP A141/5 (*Yoginījālamahātantrarāja*): paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī.

Yoginīsaṃcāra with the commentaries of Tathāgatarakṣita and Alakakalaśa, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Text Series 21. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies.

Yoginīsaṃcāra: the Śaiva *Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa* incorporated in the third *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*.

Ratnāvalī: *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī. Vol. 1: The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*, ed. Michael Hahn, Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1982.

Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa, ed. M.A. Stein. Reprint. Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1960. First published in 1892.

Rājānakavaṃśapraśaṃsā. BLO MS Stein Or. e. 17: paper; Śāradā script; A.D. 1894.

Rāmacarita of Saṃdhyākaranandin, ed. Hara Prasad Shastri. Memoirs of the ASB 3,1. Calcutta: ASB, 1910.

Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha. Published in volume 1 of *Rauravāgama*.

Rauravāgama, ed. N. R. Bhatt. 3 Vols. Publications de l'IFI 18.1–3. Pondicherry: IFI, 1961, 1972, 1988.

Laghutantraṭīkā of Vajrapāṇi, ed. Claudio Cicuzza. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2001.

Laghuśaṃvaratantra, also known as *Cakrasaṃvaratantra*, *Laghvabhidhānatantra*, and *Herukābhidhānatantra*. Baroda, Maharaja Sayajirao University, Oriental Institute, MS Acc. 13290 ('*Herukavidhānatantra*'): palm-leaf; Kuṭila script; incomplete; undated. Also accessible are two paper manuscripts; but these are merely apographs of this, reproducing its lacunae. For commentaries see under *Cakrasaṃvaraṭīkā*, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, *Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti*, and *Laghutantraṭīkā*.

Lokaprakāśa, attributed to Kṣemendra, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo Shastri. KSTS 75. Srinagar, 1947.

Vajrajvālodayā nāma śrīherukasādhanopayikā of Ānandagarbha. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibiliothek, Göttingen, MS Xc 14/39 (a copy of the negatives of photographs taken of the codex that contains this work by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana when it was in the Ngor monastery in Tibet), f. 170r6–186r5: palm-leaf; Newari script; 14th century (?).

Vajraḍākamahātantra. TUL MS 342 (New), 326 (Old): palm-leaf: Newari script; undated.

Vajravārāhīkalpa. NAK MS 3-235, NGMPP E138/10: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī; A.D. 1894.

Vajrāmṛtatantra. ULC MS Or. 158 (uncatalogued): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1162. Uncatalogued. In the upper left corner of f. 1r is the following note: *oṃ vajrāmṛtatantra* || **vajrāralitantra* (*vajrārali* corr. : *vajrāraṇi* Cod.) || *buddhakapālatantra*. As it survives the codex contains only parts of the *Vajrāmṛtatantra* and the *Buddhakapālatantra*.

Vajrārali. See *rDo rje ā ra li* under Tibetan Texts.

Vajrāvalī A: *Vajrāvalī nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Mahāpaṇḍita Abhayākaragupta. NAK MS 5-841, NGMPP B31/14: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; pre-1200; some replacement folios in Newari script and Devanāgarī.

Vajrāvalī B: *Vajrāvalī: a Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal Containing the Ritual and Delineation of Maṇḍalas*, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka 239. New Delhi: Sharada Rani, 1977.

Vanaratnastotrasaptaka of Āditya. HAHN 1996.

**Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā*. Folios 893r14–908r9 and 929v7–931v23 of an untitled and undated paper manuscript in the Śāradā script containing the Paddhatis for various mostly non-Śaiva ritual procedures, predominantly Śāntis, Vratas, Pratiṣṭhās, and Dānas. SORL MS 2B15, folios numbered from 785 to 1089.

Vāmakeśvarīmatavivaraṇa: *Vāmakeśvarīmata* with the commentary (*-vivaraṇa*) of Jayaratha, ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 66. Srinagar, 1945.

Vāsavadattā, ed. Fitzedward Hall. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1859.

Vāsudevakalpa of the *Mahālakṣmīsaṃhitā*. KLK MS 420, NGMPP C44/6: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1254/5. Final colophon: *iti pañcarātre mahālakṣmīsaṃhitāyāṃ vāsudevakalpaṃ samāptam*. Draft edition prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

Vimalaprabhā: *Vimalaprabhāṭīkā of Kalkin Śrīpuṇḍarīka on Śrīkālacakratantrarāja by Śrīmañjuśrīyaśas*, ed. Vrajavallabh Dwivedi and S.S. Bahulkar. Rare Buddhist Text Series 13. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1994.

Viṣṇudharmottara, ed. Kṣemarāja Kṛṣṇadāsa. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985. Reprint of 1912 edition (Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press).

Viṣvaksenasaṃhitā, ed. Lakshmi Narasimha Bhatta. Kendriya Sanskrita Vidyapeetha Series 17. Tirupati, 1972.

Vīṇāśikhatantra. GOUDRIAAN 1985.

Vīravajra. See *Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Vīrāgama. IFP MS Transcript 30.

Vṛddhasvacchanda: *Vṛddhasvacchandasaṃgrahatantram*, ed. Prakash Pandey. Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series 50. Allahabad: Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, [2001?].

Vṛddhasvacchanda. SORL MS 1514: paper; Śāradā script. This is the manuscript used by Pandey for his edition of the text.

Śāktapramoda, compiled by Rāja Devanandan Singh. Reprint. Bombay: Khemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, 1995. First published in 1890.

Śāṅkhāyanagṛhyasūtra, ed. S.R. Seghal. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 42. 2nd revised edition. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1987.

Śāradātilaka of Lakṣmaṇadeśika with the commentary (*Padārthādarśa*) of Rāghavabhaṭṭa, ed. Arthur Avalon. Tantrik Text Series 17. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. First published in 1933 (Calcutta: Sanskrit Press).

Śāśvatavajra. See *De kho na nyid mkhas pa* under Tibetan Texts

Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā, an anonymous commentary on the *Śivapūjāstava* of Jñānaśambhu, ed. K.M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrī. Śivāgamasaṅghaprakāśitagranthasaṅkhyā 19. Devakōṭṭai: Śivāgamasaṅgha, 1935.

Śaivaparibhāṣā of Śivāgrayogīndra-Jñānaśivācārya, ed. H.R. Rangasway Iyengar and R. Ramasastri. Oriental Research Institute Series 90. Mysore: Mysore Oriental Research Institute, 1950.

Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī of Vedajñānaguru II. DAGENS 1979.

Saṃpuṭodbhava. ASB, MS G 4854: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; perhaps 12th century.

Saṃvarodaya. TSUDA 1974.

Saṃvarodayā: *Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya of Ratnagiri. TUL MS 450 (New), 296 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1056.

Saduktikarṇāmṛta, compiled by Śrīdharadāsa, ed. Sures Chandra Banerji. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965.

Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 6. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute, 1960.

Saptaśatika-Kālottara. See *Kālottaratantra*.

Sarvajñānottara. A = NAK MS 1–1692, NGMPP A43/12: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; B = IFP MS Transcript 334.

Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha. HORIUCHI 1997 and 1983.

Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra. SKORUPSKI 1983.

Sarvabuddhasamāyoga/Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara. See *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba* under Tibetan Texts.

Sarvavajrodaya of Ānandagarbha. NAK MS 3-360. NGMPP A48/7 ('*Sarvavajrodakā*'): palm-leaf: early Newari script; A.D. 1059.

Sarvavajrodaya of Ānandagarbha: Vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalopāyikā-sarvavajrodaya, ed. Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai. *Taishō daigaku sōgō-bukkyō-kenkyūjo kiyō* 8, 1986.

Sarvollāsatantra of Sarvānandanātha, ed. Rāsamohana Cakravartin with an introduction by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya. Calcutta: Herambacandra Bhaṭṭācārya, 1953.

Sātvatasaṃhitā with the commentary of Alaśiṅga Bhaṭṭa, ed. Vraja Vallabha Dwivedi. Library Rare Texts Publication Series 6. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1982.

Sādhananidhi of Kambalapāda, a commentary (*pañjikā*) on the *Herukābhidhāna* (*Cakrasaṃvaratantra*). NAK MS 4-122, NGMPP B31/20: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.

Sādhanamālā, ed. Benoytosh Bhattacharya. GOS 41. 2 vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1968.

Sāmbapañcāśikā with the commentary of Kṣemarāja, ed. Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyamālā 13. Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1889.

Sārdhatriśatikālottara with the commentaty of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 61. Pondicherry: IFP, 1979.

Siddhayogeśvarīmata. See TÖRZSÖK 1999.

Siddhāntapaddhati of Jñānaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 374–394.

Siddhāntuśekhara of Viśvanātha, ed. K. Sītārāma Somayājin and Śiva Śrī Talakāḍu Āgamika Kṛṣṇadīkṣita. Manonmaṇīgranthamālā 20. Mysore: K. Sītārāma Somayājin, 1971.

Siddhāntasamuccaya of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 206, pp. 56–111.

Siddhāntasārapaddhati of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva (r.c. 1018–1060). A = NAK MS 1-1363, NGMPP B28/29: palm-leaf; old Newari script; A.D. 1077/8; B = NAK MS 5-743, NGMPP B28/19: palm-leaf; old Newari script; A.D. 1111/2.

Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhyā of Anantaśambhu. Published in five parts in the *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library Madras*: Vol. 17.1, pp. 29–68 (ed. A. A. Ramanathan and T. H. Viswanathan); Vols. 17.2, pp. 1–48; 18.1, pp. 1–64 and 19.1, pp. 53–84 (ed. R. K. Parthasarathi and T. H. Viswanathan); Vol. 19.2 pp. 1–48 and Vol. 20.2, pp. 49–71 (ed. T. H. Viswanathan, P. G. Seetharaman and R. Ganesan). Madras, 1965–1968.

Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa compiled by Vidyākara, ed. D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale. Harvard Oriental Series 42. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Subhāṣitasaṃgraha: Subhāṣita-Saṃgraha. An Anthology of Extracts from Buddhist Works Compiled by an Unknown Author to Illustrate the Doctrines of Scholastic and of Mystic (Tāntrik) Buddhism, ed. Cecil Bendall. *Le Muséon* 4, 1903, pp. 373–403 (Part 1), and 4, 1904, pp. 5–46 (Part 2).

Sūkṣmāgama. IFP MS Transcript 1003.

Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla. ULC MS Or. 149: palm-leaf; Pāla script. A critical edition of the text is being prepared for publication by Professors Harunaga Isaacson and Francesco Sferra, which they have kindly allowed me to consult.

Somaśambhupaddhati (the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu). BRUNNER 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998.

Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcripts 457 and 170.

Saurasaṃhitā. Unpublished edition prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa. NAK MS 2–229, NGMPP B11/4: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; A.D. 810.

Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa: *Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ*, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāī. Mahendraratnagranthamālā 2. Kathmandu, 1988.

Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa. Adhyāyas 1–25. ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER, and ISAACSON 1998.

Sthitisamāsa of Sahajavajra. NAK MS 5-139, NGMPP B24/4 ('*Kośakārikā*'): palm-leaf; 14 folios; incomplete, lacking folios 3, 9, 13, 15, and 19; Newari script; perhaps 13th century. Mantranaya section: ff. 11r3–18v5.

Svacchandatantra with the commentary (*Svacchandoddyota*) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay, 1921-35.

Svacchandalalitabhairavatantra. NAK MS 1–224, NGMPP B28/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1067/8.

—. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 1–356.

Svāyambhuva. IFP MS Transcript 133.

Svāyambhuvapañcarātra. NAK MS 1-1648 ('*Pañcarātra[prakīrṇa]*'), NGMPP A54/9: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1027. Paṭala colophons: *iti pañcarātre mahājñāne ...*, *iti pañcarātre*, and *iti pañcarātre svayaṃbhuve ....* Unpublished transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha: *śrīśaivāgame svāyaṃbhuvasūtrasaṅgrahaḥ (svayambhuvā maharṣibhya uddiṣṭaḥ)*, ed. Veṅkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Mysore, 1937.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha. IFP MS Transcript 39. An inflated south-Indian redaction.

Haracaritacintāmaṇi of Rājānaka Jayadratha, ed. Paṇḍita Śivadatta and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyamālā 61. Bombay, 1897.

Haracaritacintāmaṇi of Rājānaka Jayadratha. A = SORL MS 1547: paper: Śāradā script and Devanāgarī; B = SORL MS 1510: paper: Śāradā; C = SORL MS 599: paper: Kashmirian Devanāgarī.

Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇa, ed. M.R. Kale. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985. Reprint of 6th edition.

Herukasādhana of Kalyāṇagarbha. *Sādhanamālā*, no. 242.

Herukasādhana of Hūṃkāravajra. See *He ru ka'i grub pa'i thabs* under Tibetan Texts.

Herukābhyudaya. See *Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba* under Tibetan Texts.

Herukābhyudayapañjikā (*Katipayākṣarā*) of Kumāracandra, ed. in *Dhīḥ* 27, pp. 148–170.

Herukābhyudayapañjikā (*Katipayākṣarā*) of Kumāracandra. KLK MS 229, NGMPP C26/2 ('*Herukābhyudayamahāyoginītantra*'): palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script.

Hevajratantra. SNELLGROVE 1959.

Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭīkā of Vajragarbha. KLK MS 128, NGMPP C14/6: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; copied in Vikramaśīlamahāvihāra, therefore before c. 1200.

JAVANESE TEXTS

Arjunawijaya of Mpu Tantular. Old Javanese. SUPOMO 1977.

Kuñjarakarṇa of Mpu Ḍusun. Old Javanese. TEEUW and ROBSON 1981.

Gaṇapatitattwa. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1958.

Jñānasiddhānta. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SOEBADIO 1971.

Deśawarṇana. = *Nāgarakṛtāgama*.

Nāgarakṛtāgama of Mpu Prapañca. Old Javanese. PIGEAUD 1960–1963.

Mahājñāna. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1962.

Wṛhaspatitattwa. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1957.

Sutasoma of Mpu Tantular. Old Javanese. SANTOSO 1975.

TIBETAN TEXTS

Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ga*, ff. 1v–33v. Translation by Advayavajra and Chings yon tan 'bar of the *Herukābhyudayamahāyoginītantra*.

mKha' 'gro ma'i dra ba'i rdo rje gur rgyud. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *nga*, ff. 30r–65v (D); sTog Palace Kanjur, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ca*, ff. 148v–202r 94, p. 369, ll. 5–6 (T). Translation by Gayadhara and Śā kya ye śes ('Brog mi) of the *Ḍākinīvajrapañjaratantra*.

'Khor lo sdom pa'i dka' 'grel dpa' bo'i yid du 'ong bzhes bya ba. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ma*, ff. 1v-41r. Translation by Dharmaśrībhadra and Rin chen bzang po of Bhavyakīrti's commentary (**Vīramanoramā*) on the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*.

'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *tsa*, ff. 1v–119v. Translation of Indrabhūti's commentary (**Śaṃvarasamuccayaḥ*) on the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*. Translators not recorded.

'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ma*, ff. 69r–156v. Translation of Devagupta's commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*. Translators not recorded.

Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi'i lo rgyus. Peking Tenjur, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *lu*, 1v–68r (A); *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi'i chos skor*, New Delhi: Chopel Legdan, 1973, reprinted in ROBINSON 1979, pp. 312–391 (B). Biographies of the Eight-four Siddhas, which the Tangut monk Smon grub shes rab claims to have heard from an Indian Guru of Tsam pa rṇa (B : *tsam pa ra* A [Champaran in N-W Bihar]) named Mi 'jigs sbyin pa dpal (Abhayadattaśrī) and then rendered into Tibetan.

rGya gar chos 'byung of Tāranātha:, ed. Anton Schiefner [*Târanâthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione Narratio. Contextum tibeticum e codicibus petropolitanis edidit Antonius Schiefner*]. St. Petersburg: Academia Scientiarum Petropolitana, 1868.

rGyud spyi. LESSING and WAYMAN 1980.

mNgon brjod rgyud bla ma. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 247r–370r. Translation by Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna and Rin chen bzang po of the *Abhidhānottaratantra*, revised first by Jñānaśrī and Khyung po chos kyi brtson 'grus and later by Ānanda and Lo chung.

bCom ldan 'das ma'i man ngag gi rjes su 'brung ba zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad pa. DT, Mdo, vol. *ba*, ff. 1v-320r. Translation by Alaṅkakadeva and Tshul khrims 'byung gnas sbas (early 12th century) of the **Bhagavatyāmnāyānusāriṇī nāma vyākhyā*, a commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* composed during the reign of Rāmapāla (c. 1072–1126) by an author who identifies himself only as a resident of the Rājajagaddala monastery (*rgyal po dza ga ta la gnas pa*).

Tha ma'i mchod pa'i cho ga (**Anteṣṭividhi*). DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *phi*, ff. 35r–38r. Translation by Phyogs dbang dga' byed and Prajñākīrti of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* of Śūnyasamādhivajra.

De kho na nyid mkhas pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ma* ff. 253r–352r. Translation by Rin chen grub of the **Tattvaviśāradā*, Śāśvatavajra's commentary (*-vṛtti*) on the *Laghuśaṃvara*. The Skt. title given at the beginning of the translation is *śrītattvaviśadā nāma śrīsamvaravṛtti*.

De kho na nyid grub pa: *De kho na nyid grub pa zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa*. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *tsu* ff. 26v–39r. Translation by Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Kumārakalaśa and Śākya 'od, of the *Tattvasiddhi* (*Tattvasiddhināma prakaraṇam*) of Śāntarakṣita.

bDe mchog nyung ngu. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 213r–246v. Translation by Padmākara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Prajñākīrti and Mar pa Chos kyi grags pa, of the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*.

rDo rje ā ra li: *rDo rje ā ra li zhes bya ba'i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *nga*, ff. 171r–176r. Translation by Gayadhara and Śā kya ye shes ('Brog mi) of the *Vajrāralimahātantrarāja*.

rDo rje mkha' 'gro: *rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po dpal rdo rje mkha' 'gro*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *kha*, ff.1r-125r. Translation by Gayadhara and 'Gos lhas btsas of the *Vajraḍākamahātantrarāja*.

rDo rje snying po rgyan gyi rgyud, DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *cha*, ff. 36r–58v. Translation by Kamalagupta and Lha ye shes rgyal mtshn of the *Vajrahṛdayālaṃkāratantra*.

rDo rje phreng ba: *rNal 'byor chen po'i rgyud dpal rdo rje phreng ba mngon par brjod pa rgyud thams cad kyi snying po gsang ba rnam par phye ba*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ca*, ff. 208r–277v. Translation by Sujanaśrījñāna and Zhi ba 'od of the *Vajramālāmahāyogatantra*.

Nor bu chen po rgyas pa'i gzhal med med khang shin tu rab tu gnas pa gsang ba'i dam pa'i gsang ba'i cho ga zhib mo'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i gzungs. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *da*, ff. 286v–309r. Translation by Vidyākaraprabha and dPal gyi lhun po, revised by Vidyākaraprabha and dPal brtsegs, of the *Mahāmaṇivipulavimānasupratiṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalpadhāraṇī*.

rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud: *rnam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par rdzogs par byang chub pa rnam par sprul pa byin gyis rlob pa shin tu rgyas pa mdo sde'i dbang po'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i chos kyi rnam grangs*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *tha*, ff. 151v–260r. Translation by Śīlendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs of the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhitantra* (**Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhivikurvitādhiṣṭhānavaipulyasūtrendrarājanāmadharmaparyāya*).

rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud chen po'i 'grel of Sangs rgyas gsang ba (*Buddhaguhya). DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *nyu*, f. 65r–*Tu*, f. 116r. Revised translation by Gzhon nu dpal of Buddhaguhya's commentary on the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhitantra*.

rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *tsu*, ff. 104v–115r. Translation by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of the former's **Yoganiruttaratantrārthāvatārasaṃgraha*.

rNal 'byor ma bzhi'i kha sbyor rgyud. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *kha*, ff. 44v–52v. Translation by Chings yon tan of the *Caturyoginīsaṃpuṭatantra*.

Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka' 'grel of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna. SHERBURNE 2003.

Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *tsu*, ff. 6v–26v. Translation by Padmākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of the **Nayatrayapradīpa* of Tripiṭakamala (Tripiṭakamalla?).

Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ma*, ff. 156v-207r. Translation by Chos skyong and Rin chen grags of Vīravajra's commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvara*.

Ri gi ā ra li'i rgyud. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *nga* ff. 176r–180v. Translation by Gayadhara and Shā kya ye shes of the *Rigi-āralitantra*.

Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka' 'grel. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ba*, ff. 246v-315r. Translation by Tāraklaśu (*sic*; Tārakalaśa?) and the Tibetan Guṇaśrī of Durjayacandra's commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvara*.

Zhib mo rdo rje. STEARNS 2001.

Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba: dpal sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba mkha' 'gro ma sgyu ma bde mchog ces bya ba'i rgyud phyi ma. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 151r–193r. Translation of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* (*Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaranāmottaratantra*). No translators recorded, but said to be the work of the Tibetan Lha rin po che; cf. Tōh. 1659, 1664–1669, 1671–1672, 1674, and 1677.

gSang ba 'dus pa'i dka' grel. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *bi*, ff. 1v–81r. Translation by Vijayaśrīdhara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Śraddhākaravarman, of the commentary by Ānandagarbha on the *Guhyasamāja* (**Guhyasamājapañjikā*).

He ru ka'i sgrub pa'i thabs. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *la*, ff. 200r–208r. Translation by Vidyākarasiṃha and Lha rin po che of the *Herukasādhana* of Hum mdzad rdo rje (Hūṃkāravajra).

SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN INSCRIPTIONS

ACHARYA, Diwakar. 1977 (Vikramasaṃvat 2054). Madhyakālmā nepāl āekā yogī śaṅkarācārya hoïnan. *Ṛtambharā* 2,2, pp. 76–96. Cited here for its critical edition of the stone inscription of Ānandadeva, A.D. 1143/4.

Annual Reports on Epigraphy (1887–1981). 1986. New Delhi: The Director General, ASI. Reprint.

BERGAIGNE, Abel. 1893. *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et Cambodge*. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 181–632. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

BURGESS, J. 1877. Rock-cut Temples at Bādāmī. *IA* 6, pp. 354–366. See FLEET 1881.

CHOUDHARY, Radha Krishna. 1958. *Select Inscriptions of Bihar*. Madhipura, Bihar: Smt. Shanti Devi.

CŒDÈS, George. 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 vols. Paris: EFEO. 1937 (vol. 1), 1942 (vol. 2), 1951 (vol. 3), 1952 (vol. 4), 1953 (vol. 5), 1954 (vol. 6), 1964 (vol. 7), 1966 (vol. 8).

ḌHAKĀL, Veṇīmādhav. 1990. Paśupatiprāṃgaṇābhilekh (saṃ. 381) ko pariṣkār. *Prācīn Nepāl / Ancient Nepal* 119, August-September 1990, Nepali section, pp. 1–6.

Epigraphia Carnatica. 1885–1965. Mysore Archaeological Department, Madras/Bangalore/Mysore.

Epigraphia Indica. Archaeological Survey of India. Calcutta/Delhi, 1892–.

FINOT, L. 1904a. Notes d'épigraphie VII: inscriptions du Quang Nam, *BEFEO* 4, pp. 83–115.

—. 1904b. Notes d'épigraphie XI: Les inscriptions de Mi-son. *BEFEO* 4, pp. 897–977.

—. 1925. Inscriptions d'Angkor. *BEFEO* 25, pp. 297–407.

FLEET, J.F. 1881. Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions. *IA* 10, pp. 57–67. This contains a lithograph of the Sanskrit inscription of the Cālukya king Maṅgalīśvara to accompany his edition published in BURGESS 1877.

—. 1888. *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and Their Successors*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 3. Calcutta: Superintendent of the Government Printing.

HUBER, Edouard. 1911. Études indochinoises. *BEFEO* 11, pp. 259–311. Cham inscriptions.

HULTZSCH, E. 1885. The Sārnāth Inscription of Mahīpāla. *IA* 14, pp. 139–140.

—. 1886. The Bhāgalpur Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla. *IA* 15, pp. 304–310.

JOHNSTON, E.H. Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 357–385.

KERN, Hendrik. 1885 & 1913. De steen van den berg Pĕnang-gungan (Surabaya), thans in 't Indian Museum te Calcutta. Met Sanskrit-inscriptie en Oudjavaansche inscriptie van 963 Çāka; ter eere van Vorst Er-langga. In KERN 1917, pp. 83–128.

—. 1910. De Sanskrit-inscriptie van het Mahākṣobhyabeeld te Simpang (stad Surabaya; 1211 Çāka). In KERN 1917, pp. 187–197.

—. 1917. *Inscripties van den Indischen Archipel*. Vol. 7 of H. Kern, *Verspreide Geschriften* (15 volumes, The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1913–28), pp. 1–226.

KIELHORN, F. 1892. The Mungir Copper-plate Grant of Devapāladeva. *IA* 21, pp. 253–258.

LASKAR, Ganga Mohan. 1907. Ashrafpur Copper-Plate Grants of Devakhaḍga. *Memoirs of the ASB* 1, pp. 85–91.

MAHALINGAM, T.V. 1988. *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*. New Delhi/Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research/Agam Prakashan.

MAJUMDAR, Nani Gopal. 2003. *Inscriptions of Bengal, Containing Inscriptions of the Candras, the Varmans and the Senas, and of Īśvaraghoṣa and Dāmodara*. New edition. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar. First published in 1929 (Rajshahi: Varendra Research Society).

MATHES, Klaus-Dieter. 2008. The "Succession of the Four Seals" (*Caturmudrānvaya*) Together with Selected Passages from Karopa's Commentary. *Tantric Studies* 1, pp. 89–130.

MIRASHI, Vasudev Vishnu. 1955. *Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 4. 2 Parts. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India.

—. 1962. Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu. *Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad* 64, pp. 3–13.

—. 1963. *Inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 5. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India.

MISRA, Vinayak. 1934. *Orissa under the Bhauma kings*. Calcutta: Vishwamitra Press. An edition and translation of the Bhauma-Kara inscriptions.

MUKHERJI, Ramaranjan and Sachindra Kumar MAITY. 1967. *Corpus of Bengal Inscriptions Bearing on History and Civilization of Bengal*. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

PANTULU, J. Ramayya. 1930. Malkāpuram Stone-pillar Inscription of Kākatīya Rudradeva (Rudrāmbā). *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society* 4, pp. 147–162.

RAJAGURU, Satyanarayan. 1962. Jayarampur Copper-Plate Inscription of the Time of Gopachandra. *Orissa Historical Research Journal* 11, pp. 206–233.

RAMESH, K.V. and S.P. TEWARI. 1990. *A Copper-plate Hoard of the Gupta Period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.

SANKARANARAYANAN, S. 1977. *The Vishṇukuṇḍis and Their Times. An Epigraphical Study*. Delhi: Agam Prakashan.

SHASTRI, H. Prasad. 1916. Seven Copper-plate Records of Land Grants from Dhenkanal. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 2, pp. 395–427.

—. 1920. Two Copper-plates from the State of Bonai. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 6, pp. 265–245.

SIRCAR, D.C. 1979. *Some Epigraphical Records of the Medieval Period from Eastern India*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

—. 1983a. *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization*. Volume II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

—. 1983b. Mūrtiśiva's Bāṇgarh Praśasti of the Time of Nayapāla. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 13, Parts 1–2, 1980–82, pp. 34–56.

South Indian Inscriptions. 1890–1999. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press / New Delhi: Director-General, ASI.

SRINIVASAN, P. R. 1987. Dārāśuram through the Inscriptions. In HERNAULT 1987, vol. 1, pp. 15–40.

TAṆḌAN, Govinda. 1999. *Paśupatikṣetrako Sāṃskṛtika Adhyayana*, part 2 (Document Volume). Kathmandu: Jharendra Shumsher Jung Rana and Manju Rana.

THAPLYAL, Kiran Kumar. 1985. *Inscriptions of the Maukharīs, Later Guptas, Puṣpabhūtis and Yaśovarman of Kanauj*. Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research / Agam Prakashan.

TRIPATHY, Narayana. 1930. The Jayapura Copper-plate grant of Dhruvananda Deva. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 16, pp. 457–472.

TRIPATHY, Snigdha. 1997. *Inscriptions of Orissa*. 2 vols. Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research.

VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra. 1996 [Vikramasaṃvat 2053]. *Licchavikālakā Abhilekha*. Kathmandu: Nepāla ra Eśiyālī Anusandhāna Kendra, Tribhuvana Viśvavidyālaya.

STUDIES AND TRANSLATIONS

ADRIAENSEN, R., H. T. BAKKER and H. ISAACSON. 1994. Towards a Critical Edition of the Skandapurāṇa. *IIJ* 37, pp. 325-331.

—. 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume 1. Adhyāyas 1-25. Critically Edited with*

Prolegomena and English Synopsis. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

AGRAWALA, R. C. 1954. A Unique Sculpture of the Jaina Goddess Saccikā. *Artibus Asiae* 17, pp. 232–234.

—. 1956. Iconography of the Jain Goddess Saccikā. *Jaina Antiquary* 21, pp. 15–16.

American Institute of Indian Studies Photograph Library: http://dsal.uchicago.edu/images/aiis/

BABB, L.A. 1993. Monks and Miracles: Religious Symbols and Images of Origin Among Osval Jains. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 52, pp. 3–21.

BAKKER, Hans. 1997. *The Vākāṭakas. An Essay in Hindu Iconology*. Gonda Indological Studies 5. Groningen: Egbert Fortsten.

BAKKER, Hans and Harunaga ISAACSON. 2004. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume IIA. Adhyāyas 26–31.14. The Vārāṇasī Cycle. Critical edition with an Introduction, English Synopsis & Philological and Historical Commentary*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

BALDISSERA, Fabrizia. 2005. *The Narmamālā of Kṣemendra. Critical Edition, Study and Translation*. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 197. [Würzburg]: Ergon.

BANDYOPADHYAYA, Bimal. 2007. *Excavations at Udayagiri-2 (1997–2000)*. Memoirs of the ASI 100. New Delhi: ASI.

BANERJI, R.D. 1931. *The Haihayas of Tripuri and Their Monuments*. Memoirs of the ASI 23. Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch.

BEAL, Samuel. 1884. *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. London: Trübner. A translation of the first five chapters of the *Da Tang Xiyu ji* 'Memoir of the Western Region during the Great Tang', an account of Xuanzang's journey to India (629), his long sojourn there (630–644), and his return to China (645), compiled by Xuanzang's assistants under his supervision in 646.

—. 1914. *The Life of Hiuen-tsiang by the Shaman Hwui Li*. Popular Edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. First published in 1911. A translation of the *Da Tang Da Ciensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 'Biography of Tripiṭaka, Master of the Dharma, of the Great Monastery of the Compassionate Benefaction during the Great Tang', the account of the life and travels of Xuanzang (602–664) completed by his disciple Huili in 649 and covering his life up to his return from India to China. The remaining five chapters (6–10), covering his life in China after his return from India, were completed by Xuanzang's disciple Yancong in A.D. 688.

BENDALL, C. 1883. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1902. *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: Gilbert and Rivington.

BHŪṬORIYĀ, Māngīlāl. 1988. *Osvāl Itihās kī Amar Bel*. Calcutta: Priyadarśī Prakāśan.

BOLON, Carol Radcliffe. 1979. The Mahākuṭa Pillar and Its Temples. *Artibus Asiae* 41, pp. 253–268.

BROWN, Robert L. 1978. The Four Stone Façades of Monastery I at Ratnagiri. *Artibus Asiae* 40, pp. 5–28.

BRUNNER, Hélène. Ed. and transl. 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 4 parts. *Première Partie: Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu; Deuxième Partie: Rituels occasionels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I: Pavitrārohaṇa, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta; Troisième Partie: Rituels occasionels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II: dīkṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha; Quatrième Partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā*. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 25. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie.

—. 1964. Les catégories sociales védiques dans le śivaïsme du sud. *JA* 252, pp. 451–72.

BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSHO. 1991. *The Ngor Maṇḍalas of Tibet. Listings of the Maṇḍala Deities*. Revised by Musashi Tachikawa, Shunzo Onoda, Keiya Noguchi, and Kimiaki Tanaka. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 4. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies. First published in 1983 under the title *Tibetan Maṇḍalas: The Ngor Collection* (Tokyo: Kōdansha).

BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun. 1994. _*Sādhanaśataka and *Sādhanaśatapañcāśikā. Two Buddhist Sādhana Collections in Sanskrit Manuscript_. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 32. Vienna: Arbeitkreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

—. 1996. The Goddess Mahācīnakramatārā (Ugratārā) in Buddhist and Hindu Tantrism. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 59, pp. 472–493.

BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun and Musashi TACHIKAWA. 1991. *Niṣpannayogāvalī. Two Sanksrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 5. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies.

CHADWICK, Henry. 1957. The Shorter Text of Luke XXII, 15–20. *Harvard Theological Review* 50, pp. 249–258.

CHAKRABARTI, Kunal. *Religious Process. The Purāṇas and the Making of a Regional Tradition*. 2001. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

CHAMPAKALAKSHMI, R. 1986. Urbanization in Early Medieval Tamilnadu. In *Situating Indian History*, edited by Sabyasachi Bhattacharya and Romila Tha-par (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 34–105. Reprinted as chapter 4 ('Developments Within: Urban Processes in the Early Medieval Period A.D. 600 to c. 1300') of her *Trade, Ideology, and Urbanization. South India 300* BC *to* A.D. *1300* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996).

CHATTOPADHYAYA, Brajadulal. 1994. *The Making of Early Medieval India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

CHAULEY, G. C. 2000. Excavated Remains at Lalitagiri, a Buddhist Site in Orissa. In *Archaeology of Orissa*, 2 volumes, edited by Kishor K. Basa and Pradeep Mohanty, Delhi, Pratibha Prakashan, pp. 441–455.

CHIMPA, Lama and Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA. 1990. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India translated from the Tibetan*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 2nd edition. First published in 1970 (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study). Tibetan title of the original: *rGya gar chos 'byung*.

COHEN, Andrew L. 1998. *Temple Architecture and Sculpture of the Noḷambas (Ninth-Tenth Centuries)*. New Delhi: Manohar.

COLAS, Gérard. 2003. History of Vaiṣṇava Traditions: An Esquisse. In *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, edited by Gavin Flood (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 229–270.

CORT, J. 1987. Medieval Jaina Goddess Traditions. *Numen* 34, pp. 235–255.

CUNNINGHAM, Sir Alexander. 1885. *Reports of a Tour in Bundelkhand and Rewa in 1883–84 and of a Tour in Rewa, Bundelkhand, Malwa, and Gwalior, in 1884–85. ASI Reports*, Vol. 21, Parts 1 and 2. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India.

DANI, A.H. 1996. Eastern Kushans and Kidarites in Gandhara and Kashmir. In *History of civilizations of Central Asia. Volume III: The crossroads of civilizations: A.D. 250 to 750*, edited by B.A. Litvinsky, Paris: Unesco, pp. 163–176.

DAGENS, Bruno. 1979. *La florilège de la doctrine śivaïte, Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī de Vedajñāna. Édition critique, traduction et notes*. Publications de l'IFI 60. Pondicherry: IFI.

——. 1984. *Entre Alampur et Śrīśailam. Recherches archéologiques en Andhra Pradesh*. 2 volumes. Publications de l'IFI 67,1–2. Pondicherry: IFI.

DATTA, Swati. 1989. *Migrant Brāhmaṇas in Northern India. Their Settlement and General Impact c.* A.D. *475–1030*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

DAVIDSON. Ronald M. 1981. The *Litany of Names of Mañjuśrī*. Text and Translation of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. In *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R.A. Stein*, Vol. 1, edited by Michel Strickmann (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 20), pp. 1–69.

——. 2002. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press.

DAVIS, Richard H. and Leslie C. ORR. 2007. People of the Festival. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 73–97.

DE CASPARIS, J.G. 1992. Some Notes on Ancient Indian Ritual in Indonesia. In *Ritual, State and History in South Asia. Essays in Honour of J.C. Heesterman*, edited by A.W. van den Hoek, D.H.A. Kolff, and M.S. Oort (Memoirs of the Kern Institute 5), Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, pp. 480–492.

DE CASPARIS, J.G. and I.W. MABBETT. 1992. Religion and Popular Beliefs of Southeast Asia Before c. 1500. Chapter 5 of *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia. Volume One. From Early Times to c. 1800*, edited by Nicholas Tarling, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 276–339.

DESAI, Rashmi. 1993. The Religious Geography of an Ancient Town: Bharuch. *South Asia* 16, pp. 61–77.

DEVAHUTI, D. 1970. *Harsha. A Political Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DEZSŐ, Csaba (ed., tr.). 2005. *Much Ado About Religion by Bhatta Jayánta*. New York University Press and the JJC Foundation.

DIKSHIT, K.N. 1938. *Excavations at Paharpur, Bengal*. Memoirs of the ASI 55. Delhi: Manager of Publications.

DIRKS, Nicholas B. 1976. Political Authority and Structural Change in Early South Indian History. *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 13, pp. 127–157.

DONALDSON, Thomas Eugene 1991. The Śava-Vāhana as Puruṣa in Orissan Images: Cāmuṇḍā to Kālī/Tārā. *Artibus Asiae* 51, pp. 107–141.

DOTSON, Brandon. 2007. "Emperor" Mu rug btsan and the 'Phang thang ma Catalogue. *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 3 (www.jiats.org), pp. 1–25.

DUNDAS, Paul. 1998. Becoming Gautama: Mantra and History in Śvetāmbara Jainism. In *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*, edited by John E. Cort (Albany: State University of New York Press), pp. 31–51 and 228–232.

——. 2002. *The Jains*. London: Routledge. 2nd edition. 1st edition, 1992.

DUTTA, Saroj. 1995. *Land System in Northern India* c. *AD 400--c. AD 700*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manorharlal.

EHRHARD, Franz-Karl. 2000. Spiritual Relationships Between Rulers and Preceptors: The Three Journeys of Vanararna (1384–1468) to Tibet. In *The Relationship Between Religion and State* (chos srid zung 'grel) *In Traditional Tibet* (Proceedings of a Seminar Held in Lumbini, Nepal, March 2000. LIRI Seminar Proceeding Series 1. Bhairahawa, Nepal: Lumbini Internationa Research Institute), edited by Christoph Cüppers, pp. 245–265.

EINOO, Shingo. 2002. Notes on the Inauguration Ceremony of a Water Reservoir. In *Kimura Kiyotaka Hakase Kanreki Kinen Ronshū (Volume in Honour of Professor Kiyotaka Kimura on his Sixtieth Birthday): East Asian Buddhism: its Genesis and Development*. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 718[71]–703[86].

ENGLISH, Elizabeth. 2002. *Vajrayoginī: Her Visualizations, Rituals, and Forms. A Study of the Cult of Vajrayoginī in India*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

FILLIOZAT, Vasundhara. 2001. *Kālāmukha and Pāśupata Temples in Dharwar*. Chennai: Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute.

FINOT, L. 1934. Manuscrits sanskrits de sādhana's retrouvés en Chine. *JA* 193, pp. 1–86.

FORTE, Antonino. 1994. Daishi. *Hōbōgirin*, pp. 1019–1034.

FORTE, Antonino and Hubert DURT 1984. Daiji. *Hōbōgirin*, pp. 679–704 (FORTE for China) and pp. 704–711 (DURT for Japan).

FRAUWALLNER, Erich. 1961. Landmarks in the History of Buddhist Logic. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5, pp. 125–148.

FULLER, C.J. 1984. *Servants of the Goddess. The Priests of a South Indian Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GELLNER, David. 1992. *Monk, Householder, and Tantric Priest: Newar Buddhism and its Hierarchy of Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GHOSE, Madhuvanti. 2002. *The Origins and Early Development of Anthropomorphic Indian Iconography*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

GHOSE, Rajeshwari. 1996. *The Lord of Ārūr: Tyāgarāja Cult in Tamilnāḍu. A Study in Conflict and Accommodation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

GONDA, J. 1966. *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View*. Leiden: Brill. Reprinted from *Numen* III and IV with Addenda and Index.

GOODALL, Dominic. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Publications du département d'Indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO.

—. 2000. Problems of Name and lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Series 3* 10, pp. 208–211.

—. 2004. *The Parākhyatantra, a Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO.

—. 2007. A first edition of the [Śatika-]Kālottara, the shortest of the non-eclectic recensions of the Kālottara. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 125–166.

GOODALL, Dominic and Harunaga ISAACSON. 2007. Workshop on the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra? *Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 3*, pp. 4–6.

GOUDRIAAN, T. 1973. Tumburu and His Sisters. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17, pp. 49–95.

—. 1985. Ed. and transl. *The Vīṇāśikhatantra: A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

GOUDRIAAN, T. and J.A. SCHOTERMAN. Ed. 1988. *The Kubjikāmatatantra. Kulālikāmnāya Version*. Leiden: Brill.

GRAY, David B. 2007. *The Cakrasamvara Tantra (The Discourse of Śrī Heruka): Study and Annotated Translation*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies (Columbia University Press).

GRIERSON, Sir George A (with the assistance of Mukundarāma Śāstrī). 1915 and 1932. *A Dictionary of the Kāshmīrī Language Compiled Partly from Materials Left by the Late Paṇḍit Īśvara Kaula*. Bibliotheca Indica, New Series 1405. Hertford: ASB.

GUNAWARDANA, R.A.L.H. 1979. *Robe and Plough: Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. Tucson: Association for Asian Studies, University of Arizona Press.

GUTSCHOW, Niels. 1997. *The Nepalese Caitya. 1500 Years of Buddhist Votive Architecture in the Kathmandu Valley*. Lumbini International Research Institute Monograph Series 1. Stuttgart and London: Axel Menges.

HAHN, Michael. 1996. Das *Vanaratnastotra* des Āditya. In *Suhṛllekhāḥ. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, edited by Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Roland Steiner (Indica et Tibetica 28), pp. 29–42.

HALL, Kenneth, R. 1996. Ritual Networks and Royal Power in Majapahit Java. *Archipel* 52, pp. 95–116.

—. 2005. Traditions of Knowledge in Old Javanese Literature, c. 1000–1500. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 36, pp. 1–27.

HANNEDER, Jürgen. Ed. and trans. 1998. *Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation*. Mālinīślokavārttika *I, 1–399*. Groningen Oriental Series 14. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

HARIMOTO, Kengo. 2006. The Date of Śaṅkara: Between the Cāḷukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. *Journal of Indological Studies* 18, pp. 85–111.

HARLE, J. C. 1994. *The Art and Architecture of the Indian Subcontinent*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. First published in 1986 by Penguin Books.

HAZRA, R.C. 1958. *Studies in the Upapurāṇas, vol. 1 (Saura and Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas)*. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.

HEITZMAN, James. 1995. State Formation in South India 850–1280. In *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 162–194.

HERNAULT, Françoise, avec les collaborations de P. R. SRINIVASAN et de Jacques DUMARÇAY. 1987. *Darasuram. Epigraphical Study, étude architecturale, étude iconographie*. Publications de l'EFEO. Mémoires archéologiques 16. 2 volumes. Paris: EFEO.

Hōbōgirin. Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises. 1929-. Paris / Tokyo : Maison franco-japonaise / Adrien-Maisonneuve.

HODGE, Stephen. 2003. *The Mahā-Vairocana-Abhisaṃbodhi Tantra with Buddhaguhya's Commentary*. London: Routledge Curzon. This is a translation both of the Tantra with Buddhaguhya's running commentary and of Buddhaguhya's *Piṇḍārtha*, his summary commentary on the same.

HOERNLE, F.R. Trans. 1890. The Pattavali or List of the Pontiffs of the Upakesa-Gachchha. *IA* 19, pp. 233–242.

HOOYKAAS, C. 1973. *Balinese Bauddha Brahmans*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, d. 80. Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co.

HORIUCHI, Kanjin. 1983. *Bon-Zō-Kan Shoe-Kongōchōgyō no Kenkyū: Bonpon Kōtei Hen, Jū Kongōkui-bon, Gōzanze-bon*. Koyasan: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo [Volume 2 of an annotated critical edition of the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*].

—. 1997. *Bon-Zō-Kan Shoe-Kongōchōgyō no Kenkyū: Bonpon Kōtei Hen, Ge Henchōbuku-bon. Gijōju-bon, Kyōri-bun*. Koyasan: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo [Volume 1 of an annotated critical edition of the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*].

HOUSMAN, A.E. 1921. The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism. *The Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18, pp. 67–84.

HUNTER, Thomas M. 2007. The Body of the King: Reappraising Singhasari Period Syncretism. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 38, pp. 27–53.

HUNTINGTON, Susan L. 1984. *The "Pāla-Sena" Schools of Sculpture*. Leiden: Brill.

—. 1985. *The Art of Ancient India: Buddhist, Hindu, Jain*. New York: Weatherhill.

Huntington Archive: *Huntington Archive of Buddhist and Related Art*: http://huntingtonarchive.osu.edu/

Indian Archaeology, A Review. New Delhi: ASI. 1953/54–. The annual report of excavations undertaken by the ASI.

ISAACSON, Harunaga. 1999. A Collection of Hevajrasādhanas and related works preserved in Sanskrit. Unpublished.

—. 2002. Ratnākaraśānti's *Bhramaharanāma Hevajrasādhana*: Critical Edition (Studies in Ratnākaraśānti's tantric works III). *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 5, pp. 151–176.

JHAVERY, M.B. 1944. *Comparative and Critical Study of Mantraśāstra (With Special Treatment of Jain Mantravāda, Being the Introduction to Sri Bhairava Padmavatikalpa)*. Sri Jain Kala Sahitya Samsodhak Series 1. Ahmedabad: Sarabhai Manilal Nawab.

KAHRS, Eivind. 1998. *Indian Semantic Analysis. The* nirvacana *tradition*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KANE, P.V. 1973–1990. *History of Dharmaśāstra*. Government Oriental Series B6. 2nd ed. (rev. and enl.). 5 vols. in 8. Poona: BORI. First published in 1930–1962.

KAJIYAMA, Yuichi. 1998. *An Introduction to Buddhist Philosophy. An Annotated Translation of the Tarkabhāṣā of Mokṣākaragupta. Reprint with corrections in the author's hand*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 42. Vienna: Arbeitkreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

KARASHIMA, Noburu. 1984. *South Indian History and Society. Studies from Inscriptions A.D. 850–1800*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. Collected articles (1968–1981).

KOSAMBI, D.D. and V.V. GOKHALE. Ed. 1957. *The Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa Compiled by Vidyākara*. Harvard Oriental Series 42. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

KOSSAK, Steven M. and Jane Casey SINGER, 1998. *Sacred Visions. Early Paintings from Central Tibet*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Exhibition Catalogue.

KREIJGER, Hugo E. 1999. *Kathmandu Valley Painting. The Jucker Collection*. London: Serindia Publications.

KREISEL, Gerd. 1986. *Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathurā-Kunst. Ein Beitrag zur Frühhinduistischen Ikonographie*. Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 5. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH.

KULKE, Hermann. 1990. The Regional Kingdoms of the Early Middle Ages. Chapter 3 of Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India* (2nd, revised edition, London: Routledge), pp. 109–161. First published in 1986 (London: Croom Helm).

——. 1995a. The Study of the State in Pre-modern India. In *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 1–47.

——. 1995b. The Early and the Imperial Kingdom: a Processural Model of Integrative State Formation in Early Medieval India. In *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 233–262.

KULKE, Hermann and Dietmar ROTHERMUND. 1990. *A History of India*. London and New York: Routledge.

KUWAYAMA, Shōshin. 1988. How Xuanzang Learned About Nālandā. In *Tang China and Beyond. Studies on East Asia from the Seventh to the Tenth Century*, edited by Antonino Forte. Italian School of East Asian Studies. Essays: volume 1, Kyoto: Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, pp. 1–33.

LALOU, Marcelle. 1953. Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroṅ-lde bcan. *JA* 241 pp. 313–353. The Ldan dkar catalogue, preserved in the Tanjur.

LESSING F.D. and A. WAYMAN. 1980. *Introduction to the Buddhist Tantric Systems. Translated from Mkhas grub rje's* Rgyud spyiḥi rnam par gźag pa rgyas brjod *With Original Text and Annotation*. New York: Samuel Weiser Inc. 2nd edition. First published in 1968 (The Hague: Brill).

LÉVI, Sylvain. 1884. Note sur la chronologie du Népal. *JA*, New Series 4, pp. 55–72.

——. 1905a. *Le Népal. Étude historique d'un royaume hindou*. 3 volumes. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études 17. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

——. 1905b. Notes chinoises sur l'Inde. V. Quelques documents sur le bouddhisme indien dans l'Asie centrale (première partie). *BEFEO* 5, pp. 253–305.

——. 1929. Autour d'Aśvaghoṣa. *JA* 215, pp. 255–285. Contains an edition of *Gurupañcāśikā* vv. 1–33.

LINROTHE, Rob. 1999. *Ruthless Compassion. Wrathful Deities in Early Indo-Tibetan Esoteric Buddhist Art*. London: Serindia Publications.

LIU, Xinru. 1994. *Ancient India and Ancient China. Trade and Religious Exchanges AD 1–600*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. First published in 1988.

LOCKE, John K., S.J. 1980. *Karunamaya. The Cult of Avalokiteśvara–Matsyendranātha in the Valley of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Prakashan for Research Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies, Tribhuvan University.

——. 1985. *Buddhist Monasteries of Nepal. A Survey of the Bāhās and Bahīs of the Kathmandu Valley*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press.

MAJUMDAR, R.C. 1971. *History of Ancient Bengal*. Calcutta: G. Bharadwaj.

MALLEBREIN, Cornelia and Heinrich VON STIETENCRON. 2008. *The Divine Play on Earth: Religious Aesthetics and Ritual in Orissa, India*. Heidelberg: Synchron.

MATSUNAGA, Yukei. 1978. *The Guhyasamāja Tantra. A New Critical Edition*. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan. The introduction (pp. vii-xix) is a reprint of 'A History of Tantric Buddhism in India', in *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization: Essays in Honor of Herbert V. Guenther on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Leslie S. Kawamura and Keith Scott, Emeryville, CA: Dharma Publishing, 1977.

——. 1985. On the Date of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. In *Tantric and Taoist Studies in honour of R.A. Stein*, edited by Michel Strickmann. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises), volume 3 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 22), pp. 882–894.

MAY, Jacques. 1967. Chingokokka. *Hōbōgirin*, pp. 322–327.

MEISTER, Michael W. et al. Ed. 1983–91. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture*. Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies, Oxford University Press. Vol. 1, Part 1: *South India, Lower Draviḍadeśa 200 B.C.–A.D. 1324* (1983); Vol. 1, Part 2: *South India, Upper Draviḍadeśa, Early Phase A.D. 550–1075* (1986); Vol. 2, Part 1: *North India, Foundations of North Indian Style, c. 250 B.C.–A.D. 1100* (1988); Vol. 2, Part 2: *North India, Period of Early Maturity, c. A.D. 700–900* (1991).

MEYER, Sir William STEVENSON, Sir Richard BURN, James Sutherland COTTON, and Sir Herbert Hope RISLEY. 1908–1931 [v. 1, 1909; v. 26, 1931]. *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*. 26 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MIAH, Abul Hashem. 1997/8. Jagaddala Vihārer Sāmpratik Khanan. *Itihas Parishad Patrika* 1404 BS.

MICHELL, George. 1990. *The Penguin Guide to the Monuments of India. Volume 1: Buddhist, Jain, Hindu*. London: Penguin Books.

MITRA, Debala. 1971. *Buddhist Monuments*. Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad.

——. 1981. *Ratnagiri (1958–61)*. Memoirs of the ASI 80. New Delhi: Director General, ASI.

MOOKERJI Radha Kumud. 1951. *Ancient Indian Education (Brahmanical and Buddhist)*. 2nd edition. London: MacMillan and Co. First published in 1947.

MULLIN, Glenn H. 1996. *Tsongkhapa's Six Yogas of Naropa*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.

——. 1997. *Readings on the Six Yogas of Naropa*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.

NEWMAN, John R. 1987. Paramādibuddha (The Kālacakra Mūlatantra) and its Relation to the Early Kālacakra Literature. *IIJ* 30, pp. 93–102.

——. 1998. The Epoch of the Kālacakra Tantra. *IIJ* 41, pp. 319–349.

NJAMMASCH, Marlene. 2001. *Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. Das frühe Mittelalter in Gujarat*. Asien- und Afrika-Studien 2 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

OBERMILLER, E. 1986. *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet by Bu-ston*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 26. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. First published in 1932.

OROFINO, Giacomella. 1996. *Sekoddeśa. A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation, with an Appendix by Raniero Gnoli on the Sanskrit Text*. Serie Orientale Roma 52. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

PAL, Pratapaditya. 1975. *Bronzes of Kashmir*. Graz: Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt.

—. 2003. *Himalayas. An Aesthetic Adventure*. Chicago: The Art Institure of Chicago in association with the University of California press and Mapin Publishing. Exhibition catalogue.

—. 2007. *The Arts of Kashmir*. With contributions by Frank Ames, Simon Digby, Gerald Larson, and John Siudmak. New York: Asia Society. Exhibition catalogue.

PETECH, Luciano. 1961. The Chronology of the Early Kings of Nepal. *East and West*, n.s. 12, pp. 227–232.

—. 1984. *Medieval History of Nepal (c. 750–1480)*. 2nd, thoroughly revised edition. Serie Orientale Roma, 10: Materials for the Study of Nepalese History and Culture. Rome: Istituto per il Medio e Estremo Oriente.

PIGEAUD, Theodore G. Th. 1960–1963. *Java in the 14th Century. A Study in Cultural History. The Nagara-Kĕrtāgama by Rakawi Prapanca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D.*. Volume I: Javanese Texts in Transcription; volume II: Notes on the Texts and Translations; volume III: Translations; volume IV: Commentaries and Recapitulation; volume V: Glossary, General Index. Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde Translation Series 4,4. Third edition, revised and enlarged. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

PINGREE, David. 1994. *Census of the Exact Sciences in Sanskrit. Series A, Volume 5*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

RASTELLI, Marion. 2007. The "Pañcarātra Passages" in Agnipurāṇa 21–70. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 189–229.

REEDY, Chandra L. 1997. *Himalayan Bonzes. Technology, Style, and Choices*. Newark and London: University of Delaware Press and Associated University Presses.

REGMI, D.R. 1965–1966. *Medieval Nepal*. 3 Parts [Part 1, 1965; Parts 2–3: 1966]. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

RHIE, Marylin M. and Robert A.F. THURMAN. 1991. *Wisdom and Compassion. The Sacred Art of Tibet*. New York: Asian Art Museum of San Francisco and Tibet House, New York in association with Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers. Exhibition Catalogue.

ROBINSON, James B. 1979. *Buddha's Lions. The Lives of the Eight-Four Siddhas*. Berkeley, California: Dharma Publishing.

ROBSON, Stuart. Trans. 1995. *Deśawarṇana (Nāgarakṛtāgama) by Mpu Prapañca*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

ROERICH, George N. 1995. *The Blue Annals*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. First published in 1949. An English translation of the *Deb ther snong po* of 'Gos lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481).

SALOMON, Richard. 1998. *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SANDERSON, Alexis. 1985. Purity and Power among the Brāhmans of Kashmir. In *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, History*, edited by M. Carrithers, S. Collins and S. Lukes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 190–216.

—. 1986. Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir. *In Mantras et diagrammes rituelles dans l'hindouisme*, edited by André Padoux. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, pp. 169–214.

—. 1988. Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. In *The World's Religions*, edited by S. Sutherland *et al.* (London: Routledge), pp. 660–704. Reprinted in *The World's Religions. The Religions of Asia*, edited by F. Hardy (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 128-172.

—. 1995a. Meaning in Tantric Ritual. In *Essais sur le Rituel III: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, edited by A.-M. Blondeau and K. Schipper (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses, Volume CII. Louvain-Paris: Peeters), pp. 15–95.

—. 1995b. Vajrayāna: Origin and Function. In *Buddhism Into the Year 2000. International Conference Proceedings* (Bangkok and Los Angeles: Dhammakaya Foundation), pp. 89–102.

—. 1995c. The Sarvāstivāda and its Critics: Anātmavāda and the Theory of Karma. In *Buddhism Into the Year 2000. International Conference Proceedings* (Bangkok and Los Angeles: Dhammakaya Foundation), pp. 33–48.

—. 2001. History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In *Les sources et le temps.*

Sources and Time. A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997, edited by François Grimal, pp. 1–47. Publications du département d'Indologie 91. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO.

—. 2002. Remarks on the text of the Kubjikāmatatantra. *IIJ* 45, pp. 1–24.

—. 2005a. The Śaiva Religion Among the Khmers, Part I. *BEFEO* 90 (2003), pp. 352–464.

—. 2005b. Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the Brahmanical Royal Chaplain with an Appendix on the Provenance and Date of the *Netratantra*. *IIJ* 47 (2004), pp. 229–300.

—. 2005c. A Commentary on the Opening Verses of the *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta. In *Sāmarasya. Studies in Indian Arts, Philosophy, and Interreligious Dialogue*, edited by Sadananda Das and Ernst Fürlinger, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, pp. 89–148.

—. 2006. The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism. *Indian Philosophical Annual 26 (2003–2005)*, pp. 143–217.

—. 2007a. The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 231–442 and (bibliography) pp. 551–582.

—. 2007b. Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The *Āṅgirasakalpa* Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālīkula, With critical editions of the *Parājapavidhi*, the *Parāmantravidhi*, and the **Bhadrakālīmantravidhiprakaraṇa*. In *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen (Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2007. Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien, 11. Indologica Halensis), pp. 195–311.

—. Forthcoming *a*. *Religion and the State: Initiating the Monarch in Śaivism and the Buddhist Way of Mantras*. Heidelberg Ethno-Indological Series. Harrassowitz.

—. Forthcoming *b*. *Śaivism and Brahmanism*.

SANTIKO, Hariani. 1995. Early Research on Sivaitic Hinduism during the Majapahit Era. In *The Legacy of Majapahit*, edited by John N. Miksic and Endang Sri Hardiati Soekatno (Singapore: National Museum of Singapore. Exhibition Catalogue), pp. 55–70.

SANTOSO, Soewito. 1975. *Sutasoma: A Study in Javanese Wajrayana*. Śatapiṭaka 213. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

SCHOPEN, Gregory. 2004. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Studies in the Buddhist Traditions.

Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

SCHMIEDCHEN, Annette. 1993. Einige Besonderheiten der buddhistischen Schenkungsinschriften under der Maitrakas. *Beiträge des Südasien-Instituts 1 (Sonderheft)*, pp. 83–108.

—. 2007. Epigraphical Evidence for the History of Atharvavedic Brahmins. In *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen (Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2007. Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien, 11. Indologica Halensis), pp. 195–311.

SETTAR, S. 1969. The Cult of Jvālāmālinī and the Earliest Images of Jvālā and Śyāma. *Artibus Asiae* 31, pp. 309–320.

—. 1992. *The Hoysaḷa Temples*. Bangalore: Institute of Indian Art History, Karnataka University, Dharwad and Kala Yatra Publications.

SFERRA, Francesco. 2005. Constructing the Wheel of Time. Strategies for Establishing a Tradition. In *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*, edited by Federico Squarcini, Firenze: Firenze University Press, pp. 253–285.

SHAHIDULLAH, M. 1928. *Les chants mystiques de Kāṇha et de Saraha. Les Dohā-koṣa (en apabhraṃśa, avec les versions tibétaines) et les Caryā (en vieux-bengali)*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

SHASTRI, H.P. 1917. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanscrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. I. Buddhist Manuscripts*. Calcutta: ASB.

SHAW, Julia and Peter SUTCLIFFE. 2003. Water Management, Patronage Networks and Religious Change: New evidence from the Sanchi dam complex and counterparts in Gujarat and Sri Lanka. *South Asian Studies* 19, pp. 73–104.

SHAW, Miranda. 2006. *Buddhist Goddesses of India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SHERBURNE, Richard. 2003. *The Complete Works of Atiśa Śrī Dīpaṃkara Jñāna*, Jo-bo-rje, *The* Lamp for the Path and Commentary, *together with the newly translated* Twenty-five Key Texts *(Tibetan and English Texts)*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.

SINCLAIR, Iain. 2008. The Problem of Tantric Sacrifice (*Mahābali*) in Newar Buddhism. In *Esoteric Buddhist Studies: Identity in Diversity. Proceedings of the International Conference on Esoteric Buddhist Studies, Koyasan University, 5 Sept.–8 Sept. 2006*, Koyasan: Koyasan University, pp. 261–264.

SINGH, Upinder. 1994. *Kings, Brāhmaṇas and Temples in Orissa. An Epigraphic Study AD 300–1147*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

SINGHAL, Sudarshana Devi. 1957. *Wṛhaspati-tattwa, an Old Javanese Philo-*

sophical Text. Śataka-piṭaka Series 1, Dvīpāntara Series 1. Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture.

—. 1958. *Gaṇapati-tattwa, an Old Javanese Philosophic Text*. Śata-Piṭaka 4; Dvīpāntara-Piṭaka 3. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

—. 1962. *Tattvajñāna and Mahājñāna (Two Kavi Philosophical Texts)*. Śatapiṭaka Series 23; Dvīpāntara-Piṭaka 6. Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

SINHA, Surajit. 1962. State Formation and Rajput Myth in Tribal Central India. *Man in India* 42, pp. 35–80. Republished in *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 233–262.

—. ed. 1987. *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and North Eastern India*. Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi.

SINHA KAPUR, Nandini. 2002. *State Formation in Rajasthan. Mewar during the Seventh-Fifteenth Centuries*. New Delhi: Manohar.

SIRCAR, D.C. 1953. The Era of the Bhauma-Karas. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 29, pp.148–55.

—. 1966. *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

—. 1975–76. Indological Notes–R. C. Majumdar's Chronology of the Pāla Kings. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 9, pp. 209–210.

SIUDMAK, John E.C. 1994. *The Stylistic Development of the Sculpture of Kashmir*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford.

SKORUPSKI, 1983. *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra, Elimination of All Evil Destinies. Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with introduction, English translation and notes*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

SLOUBER, Michael. 2007. The Manuscripts of the Kriyākālaguṇottara. *Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 5*, pp. 9–16.

SMITH, Vincent A. 1962. *The Early History of India from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest, Including the Invasion of Alexander the Great*. 4th edition, revised by S.M. Edwardes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

SNELLGROVE, David L. 1959. Ed. and transl. *The Hevajra Tantra. A Critical Study*. London Oriental Series 6. London: Oxford University Press. Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the *Hevajra* with the commentary *Yogaratnamālā* of Kāṇha.

SOEBADIO, Haryati. 1971. *Jñānasiddhānta*. Bibliotheca Indonesica 7. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

STEARNS, Cyrus. 2001. *Luminous Lives. The Story of the Early Masters of the Lam 'Bras Tradition in Tibet*. Somerville, Massachusetts: Wisdom Publications. This contains an edition and annotated translation of the *Zhib mo rdo*

rje of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po.

STEIN, Burton. 1994. *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

—. 1998. All the King's *Mana*: Perspectives on Kingship in Medieval South India. In *Kingship and Authority in South Asia*, edited by J.F. Richards (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 133–188.

STEIN, M. A. 1900. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir. Translated with an introduction, commentary and appendices*. 2 Volumes. Westminster: A. Constable.

STÖHR, Waldemar and Piet ZOETMULDER. 1968. *Les religions d'Indonésie*. Paris: Payot. Translated by L. Jospin. Originally published in German in 1965 (*Die Religionen Indonesiens*, Stuttgart: W. Kolhammer).

STRICKMANN, Michel. 1996. *Mantras et mandarins: le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*. Paris: Gallimard.

STUART-FOX, David J. 2002. *Pura Besakih. Temple, religion and society in Bali*. Verhandelingen van der Koninklijk Institut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 193. Leiden: KITLV Press.

SUGIKI, Tsunehiko. 2001. Cakrasaṃvaratantra no seiritsu ni tsuite—oyobi Jayabhadra saku Śrīcakrasaṃvarapañjikā kōtei bonpon— [On the making of *Śrīcakrasaṃvaratantra*—with a critical Sanskrit text of Jayabhadra's *Śrīcakrasaṃvarapañjikā*]. *The Chisan Gakuhō / Journal of Chisan Studies* 64, pp. (91)–(141).

SUPOMO, S. 1972. 'Lord of the Mountains' in the fourteenth century Kakawin. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 128, pp. 281–297.

—. 1977. Ed. and trans. *Arjunawijaya. A Kakawin of mpu Tantular*. 2 volumes. Bibliotheca Indonesica 14. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

SWAMY B.G.L. 1975. The Gōlaki School of Śaivism in the Tamil Country. *Journal of Indian History* 53, pp. 167–209.

SZÁNTÓ, Péter-Dániel. 2008a. Antiquarian Enquiries into the Initiation Manuals of the Catuṣpīṭha. *Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 6*, pp. 2–12.

—. 2008b. Review of GRAY 2007. *Tantric Studies* 1, pp. 215–219.

TAKAKUSU, Junjiro and Kaigyoku WATANABE. 1924–1932 (Taishō 13-Shōwa 7). *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*. 73 volumes. Tōkyō: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai.

TAGARE, Ganesh Vasudev. 1987. *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṃśa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. First published in 1948 (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute).

TALBOT, Cynthia. 2001. *Precolonial India in Practice: Society, Region, and Identity in Medieval Andhra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TAMOT, Kashinath *et. al.* 2000. *A Dictionary of Classical Newari Compiled* *from Manuscript Sources*. Kathmandu: Nepal Bhasa Dictionary Committee.

TANAKA, Kimiaki. 1996. *Indo Chibetto Mandara no Kenkyū* (A Study of Indian and Tibetan Maṇḍalas). Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

TANEMURA, Ryugen. 2004a. Indo Mikkyō no Sōgi: Śūnyasamādhivajra saku Mṛtasugatiniyojana ni tsuite [The Funeral in Esoteric Buddhism: On the Mṛtasugatiniyojana by Śūnyasamādhivajra]. *Sisehigaku Kenkyū* 2004-nen Akigō, pp. 349(26)–328(47).

——. 2004b. *Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Selected Sections*. Groningen Oriental Studies 19. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

——. 2007. Mṛtasugatiniyojana: A Manual of the Indian Buddhist Tantric Funeral. *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 4, pp. 2–6.

TEEUW, A and S.O. ROBSON. 1981. Ed. and trans. *Kuñjarakarṇa Dharmakathana. Liberation Through the Law of the Buddha. An Old Javanese Poem by Mpu Ḍusun*. Bibliotheca Indonesica 21. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

THURSTON, Edgar, assisted by K. RANGACHARI. 1909. *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*. 7 vols. Madras: Government Press.

TOKUNAGA, Muneo. 1994. Description of the temples and *tīrthas* in the Nīlamatapurāṇa. *Vss.* 989–1356a. In *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir*, edited by Yasuke Ikari (Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University), pp. 399–421.

TOMABECHI, Toru. 2007. The extraction of *mantra* (*mantroddhāra*) in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogatantra*. In *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ. Essays Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, edited by Birgit Kellner, Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, Michael Torsten Much and Helmut Tauscher, Vienna: Arbeitkreis für Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, pp. 903–923.

——. 2008. Vitapāda, Śākyamitra, and Āryadeva: On a Transitional Stage in the History of *Guhyasamāja* Exegesis. In *Esoteric Buddhist Studies: Identity in Diversity. Proceedings of the International Conference on Esoteric Buddhist Studies, Koyasan University, 5 Sept.–8 Sept. 2006*, Koyasan: Koyasan University, pp. 171–177.

TORRICELLI, Fabrizio and Āchārya Sangye T. NAGA. 1995. *The Life of the Mahāsiddha Tilopa by Mar-pa Chos-kyi bLo-gros*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives. Text and translation of a short spiritual biography (*rnam thar*) of Tilopā, ff. 1v–11v of vol. *kha* of the *bDe mchog mkha' 'gro snyan rgyud*, a collection of texts of the Mar pa Kagyu tradition.

TÖRZSÖK, Judit. 1999. *The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits. A critical edition of selected chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata(tantra) with annotated translation and analysis*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford. The chapters edited and translated are 1–8, 10–19, 21–22, and 29–32 (the last).

TRIBE, A.H.F. 1994. *The Names of Wisdom. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Chapters 1–5 of Vilāsavajra's Commentary on the Nāmasaṃgīti, with Introduction and Textual Notes*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford.

TSUDA, Shinichi. Ed. and trans. 1974. *The Saṁvarodaya-Tantra: Selected Chapters*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press.

TSUKAMOTO, Keisho, MATSUNAGA Yukei, and ISODA Hirofumi. Eds. 1989. *Bongo butten no kenkyū 4 [Mikkyō kyōten hen] / A Descriptive Bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature Vol. IV: The Buddhist Tantra*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

TUCCI, Giuseppe. 1988. *Rin-chen bzaṅ-po and the Renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet Around the Millenium*. English version of Indo-Tibetica II, first draft translation by Nancy Kipp Smith under the direction of Thomas J. Pritzker, edited by Lokesh Chandra. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1988. First published in Italian in 1932, Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia.

UI, Hakuju. 1963. *Daijōbutten no kenkyū* (A study of Mahāyāna Buddhism). Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

UI, Hakuju, Munetada SUZUKI, Yensho KANAKURA, and Tokan TADA. Ed. 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.

VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra and Kamal P. MALLA. 1985. *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī. A facsimile edition prepared by the Nepal Research Centre in collaboration with the National Archives, Kathmandu. With an introduction, a transcription, Nepali and English translations, a glossary and indices*. Nepal Research Centre Publications 9. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

VAN SCHAIK, Sam. 2008. A Definition of Mahāyoga: Sources from the Dunhuang Manuscripts. *Tantric Studies* 1, pp. 45–88.

VETTER, Tilmann. 1992. On the Authenticity of the Ratnāvalī. *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 46, pp. 492–506.

VON STIETENCRON, Heinrich. 1966. *Indische Sonnenpriester. Sāmba und die Śākadvīpīya-Brāhmaṇa. eine textkritische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie zum indischen Sonnenkult*. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Band 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

WALLIS, Christopher. 2008. The Descent of Power: Possession, Mysticism and Initiation in the Śaiva Theology of Abhinavagupta. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 36, pp. 247–295.

WEST, Martin L. 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

WITZEL, M. 1986. On the Archetype of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. *IIJ* 29, pp. 249–259.

YOKOCHI, Yuko. 1999a. The Warrior Goddess in the *Devīmāhātmya*. In *Living with Śakti. Gender, Sexuality and Religion in South Asia*, edited by Masakazu TANAKA and Musashi TACHIKAWA. Senri Ethnological Studies. 50. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

——. 1999b. Mahiṣāsuramardinī Myth and Icon: Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa*, II. In *Studies in the History of Indian Thought (Indo-Shisōshi Kenkyū)* 11. Kyoto: Association for the Study of the History of Indian Thought, pp. 65–103

ZAKARIA, A.K.M. 1994. Jagaddala Mahavihara. *Journal of the Varendra Research Museum* 8.

ZIMMERMANN, Michael. 2000. A Mahāyānist Criticism of Arthaśāstra: The Chapter on Royal Ethics in the *Bodhisattva-gocaropya-viṣaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa-sūtra*. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 1999*, Tokyo: IRIAB, Soka University, pp. 177–211.

ZOETMULDER, P.J with the collaboration of S.O. Robson. 1982. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. 2 parts. Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

CONVENTIONS IN THE FOOTNOTES

Where I have rejected the reading of a text-edition, inscription, or manuscript, I have substituted my proposed reading and marked the point at which it begins with a superscript asterisk. Its end is indicated by the beginning of the parenthesis that follows. In that I first state whether I judge the proposed reading to be a simple correction (corr.), an emendation (em.), a conjecture (conj.), or, in one case, a diagnostic conjecture (diagn. conj.). By the last I mean a conjecture that restores what I take to be the intended meaning of the author while recognizing that an alternative wording is possible. I maintain no clear-cut distinction between corrections, emendations, and conjectures. I intend thereby only to distinguish approximately between three levels of decreasing obviousness. Where the reading adopted is my own proposal no further information is added. Where it has been proposed by another I have given the surname of the proposer after the abbreviation (e.g. em. MIRASHI). These abbeviations, or abbreviations followed by a name, are followed by a single space, a colon, and a single space, after which I have given the reading that I have rejected. That is followed by an

abbreviation that indicates whether the source is the edition of the text (Ed.) or inscription (Ep.) listed in the bibliography, or the manuscript (Cod.) listed in the same. Where more than one manuscript has been cited, they are distinguished by the sigla assigned in the same. When I have given a translation of a passage in which I have rejected a reading or readings I indicate this in the translation only in the case of what I have classified as conjectures, e.g. '*Vidyeśvaras on the northern altar (conj.)'. Any testimonium is given in square brackets after the reading that it supports. In a few cases in which I have judged a word to have been lost I have inserted it between angle brackets (e.g. <*ca*>) and where I have judged that insertion to be less than certain I have followed it with a question mark (e.g. <*svadharma*?>). In my translations I have marked the corresponding words in the same way. Where I can offer no cure but judge that the intended meaning can be deduced from the context I have given that meaning in my translation enclosed between a superscript asterisk and a question mark in parenthesis. Where I judge a reading to be corrupt but can offer no cure even on the level of meaning alone I have marked the beginning of the reading with a superscript asterisk followed by a question mark in parenthesis, and marked the corresponding place in my translation with a superscript asterisk followed by three dots and a question mark in parentheses. In general I have standardized the Sandhi and orthography of the Sanskrit in all citations, whether from texts or inscriptions. All translations of the text-passages that I have cited are my own.

All Souls College, Oxford